

Desk

New Series

Volume VII, Number 25

January 1956

The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

Editors

PETER ALEXANDER, M.A., F.B.A.
NORMAN DAVIS, M.B.E., M.A.

Assistant Editor

JEAN ROBERTSON, M.A.

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
MAR 7 - 1956

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter. By Kenneth Sisam	I
Punctuation in an Early Manuscript of Love's <i>Mirror</i> . By Elizabeth Zeeman	11
The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century. By E. F. Hart	19
The 'Three Glorious Victories' in <i>Annus Mirabilis</i> . By James Kinsley	30
Yeats's Supernatural Songs. By Peter Ure	38

NOTES

The Word <i>Feud</i> (E. J. Dobson)	52
'The Devonshire Manuscript' and its Medieval Fragments (Ethel Seaton)	55
Ben Jonson's <i>Chloridia</i> : Fame and her Attendants (R. I. C. Graziani)	56
The Ending of Clough's <i>Dipsychus</i> (James Bertram)	59

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; JOHN BUTT, B.Litt., M.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, D.Lit.; SIR WALTER GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt., F.B.A.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; DOROTHY WHITELOCK, M.A., Litt.D.; F. P. WILSON, D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (continued)

REVIEWS, ETC.:

Runica Manuscripta, by R. Derolez, 61; Hiatus in English, by Aasta Stene, 63; The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry, by Randolph Quirk, 64; Cambridge Middle English Lyrics, edited by Henry A. Person, 68; Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance, by John Buxton, 69; Endeavors of Art: a Study of form in Elizabethan drama, by Madeleine Doran, 73; *The Tempest*, edited by Frank Kermode (The Arden Shakespeare), 75; Christopher Cooper's *English Teacher* (1687), edited by Bertil Sundby, 77; *A Letter to Dion*, by Bernard Mandeville, edited by Bonamy Dobrée, 81; The Augustan World. Life and Letters in Eighteenth-Century England, by A. R. Humphreys, 82; Alexander Pope. Minor Poems, edited by Norman Ault, completed by John Butt, 83; The Percy Letters. The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes, edited by A. F. Falconer, 86; The Works of Jane Austen, Volume VI, edited by R. W. Chapman, 88; Wordsworth—a Re-interpretation, by F. W. Bateson, 90; John Keats: The Living Year, by Robert Gittings, 92; Walter Savage Landor. A Biography, by R. H. Super, 94; John Ruskin, by Joan Evans, 96; William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival, by Robert Speaight, 97; Fair Greece Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron, by Terence Spencer, 99; Transitions in American Literary History, edited by Harry Hayden Clark, 100; The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry, by W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., 102; Short Notices, 104; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 108.

CANTERBURY, LICHFIELD, AND THE VESPASIAN PSALTER

By KENNETH SISAM

IN 'From Canterbury to Lichfield'¹ Professor S. M. Kuhn discusses five early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with a view to establishing their place of origin: they are the Vespasian Psalter, the Golden Gospels at Stockholm, Cotton Tiberius C ii, the Book of Cerne, and B.M. Royal 1 E vi. The first four have an interest for English studies because they contain vernacular glosses or scraps of prose; and as the title of his article indicates, Professor Kuhn denies all five manuscripts to Canterbury and thinks that all of them were written at Lichfield. Much of the evidence is gathered from fields in which I cannot claim expertness; but it may be useful to examine the methods which lead to a conclusion so far-reaching in its implications. To do so I must sometimes shorten and sharpen arguments, trusting that the bracketed page-references will lead readers back to the original articles.

I. *Thomas of Elmham*

First comes a question of identity. Early in the fifteenth century Thomas of Elmham, a monk of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, described the books which, according to the tradition of his time, were given to the Abbey by Augustine. Two psalters are noticed in some detail. The first has disappeared;² the second was associated with MS. Vespasian A 1 by Wanley in his Catalogue of 1705.³ According to Wanley, Elmham's description agrees exactly (*ad amussim*); Thompson in the *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the British Museum*, ii, where the contents of the Vespasian Psalter are detailed, says it 'agrees most closely'; M. R. James that 'the preliminary matter agrees exactly';⁴ Dr. E. A. Lowe that 'the contents agree closely';⁵ Warner that the Vespasian Psalter 'is undoubtedly one of

¹ *Speculum*, xxiii (1948), 591-629. This follows up his earlier article 'The Vespasian Psalter and the Old English Charter Hands' in the same journal, xviii (1943), 458-83.

² Leland saw the second psalter, not the first, on the eve of the Dissolution, when the dispersal of the library was already advanced. His notes are conveniently printed by M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), pp. lxxix and 504.

³ Not first by Westwood in 1868 (Kuhn, p. 599). Dr. Kuhn's other references to Wanley suggest that he had not access to his Catalogue, which is the primary authority: see p. 222, and p. 172 f., where Elmham's description was first printed.

⁴ *Ancient Libraries*, p. lxvi.

⁵ *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, ii (1935), no. 193. Dr. Kuhn does not refer to this monumental work by the first living authority on early Latin manuscripts.

the two Psalters described by Elmham'.¹ The identification is accepted by other leading palaeographers, e.g. by Traube-Lehmann and by Wilmart.² Yet Sweet says 'there is in general complete divergence' between the book Elmham described and the Vespasian Psalter;³ and Professor Kuhn is sure that Elmham described a smaller book of different content (p. 602). On what should be a simple matter of fact there is a sharp conflict between the highest authorities on manuscripts and two specialists in Old English.

It is usually safest to follow acknowledged experts in their special fields; but some explanation of this long-standing difference is desirable. Elmham describes the preliminary matter of both his ancient psalters up to the point where the psalms begin, and then passes straight to the end-matter, giving no account of the psalter proper.

(a) Thompson distinguishes fifteen articles in the original preliminaries of the Vespasian Psalter, and it is unquestioned that Elmham names thirteen of them in the right order. Dr. Kuhn says that articles 2 and 7 are not in Elmham's description, and, linking this with a discrepancy in the numbering of folios,⁴ argues that the preliminaries described by Elmham were shorter than those of Vespasian A 1 (p. 601). Article 2, a brief second preface, is the only one of the fifteen articles that is not distinguished in the manuscript either by an *Incipit* or by a separate heading: it could reasonably be treated as part of the Preface, and in fact Wanley does not mention it in his detailed description of Vespasian A 1. To say that Elmham 'omits [article 7] altogether' (p. 600) does less than justice to his intelligence. It is a short piece headed *Incipit Origo Psalmorum*, and is closely associated with the following article, which begins: *Nunc exposuimus originem psalmorum* and goes on to explain the Hebrew division of the psalter into five books. Elmham, reasonably enough, takes the two articles together: 'Deinde in quarto folio de Origine Psalmorum, in cuius fine distinguit psalterium in quinque libros', &c. So Elmham's list tallies with the long series of preliminaries in the Vespasian Psalter. And that

¹ Sir George Warner, *Illuminated MSS. in the British Museum* (London, 1903), in his description of Vesp. A 1.

² L. Traube, *Zur Paläographie und Handschriftkunde*, ed. P. Lehmann (Munich, 1909), p. 193. A. Wilmart in *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii (1911), 352 n.

³ H. Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts* (E.E.T.S., 1885), p. 183.

⁴ Elmham gives the folios on which the preliminary articles he notices occur. The numbers correspond with the Vespasian Psalter at his ff. 1, 3, 5, 8, and 11, but are one behind at his ff. 4, 6, and 7. The Vespasian Psalter had no folio numbering in his time, and the natural explanation is that, when counting the leaves as he recorded the articles, or when calculating from a folio-number already given, he made some mistakes. The exact folio is not important for his purpose and small errors are easy to make. A regularly written manuscript which fell behind at ff. 4, 6, 7 because it omitted articles 2 and 7 would not come right at ff. 5, 8, 11.

series is distinctive: it cannot, I think, be matched in any other extant psalter.¹

(b) Elmham notices a picture of Samuel at the beginning of the psalms: 'incipit textus psalterii cum imagine Samuelis sacerdotis'. There is no such picture in the Vespasian Psalter now.² But one leaf at the beginning of the psalms has been stolen, no doubt because it was handsomely decorated; and the amount of text missing could have been accommodated on the verso, leaving the recto free for the picture.

(c) From the picture of Samuel, Elmham passes straight to a distinctive feature of the end-matter: 'et in fine eiusdem psalterii sunt hymni de matutinis, de vespertinis, et de dominico die, sicut in alio psalterio praenotato habentur'. He means that these three hymns have been mentioned already in his account of the first 'Gregorian' psalter.³ There they appear (though not all together) and are identified by their first lines as 'Splendor paternae glorie', 'Deus creator omnium', and 'Rex aeternae domine'. After the canticles (which regularly follow the psalms in a psalter-codex) the early or uncial part of Vespasian A 1 ends with exactly these three hymns, easily distinguishable by their verse form. As far as I know, this arrangement of the end-matter is not to be found in any other English psalter.

(d) The heart of the difference lies in the treatment of matter added later to the Vespasian Psalter. Elmham does not mention the prayer *Suscipere digneris* which is added to the Vespasian preliminaries in eleventh-century Caroline minuscule (p. 601). 'Part Three [the eleventh-century supplement on added leaves at the end], which begins with such important items as the *Te Deum* and the *Quicumque vult*, cannot have been a part of Elmham's Psalter, for he makes no mention of anything in Part Three' (p. 602). Above all: 'No one could overlook the Old English glosses which appear in every part of the Psalter text, and it is difficult to imagine any motive for Elmham's

¹ Its significance for identification is minimized in Dr. Kuhn's remark: 'Such pieces were prefixed to other psalters, e.g. the Lambeth Psalter and the Psalter of Charlemagne at Vienna' (p. 602). These examples serve rather to bring out its distinctive character. The early eleventh-century Lambeth Psalter contains none of the preliminary articles in the Vespasian Psalter. The Psalter of Charlemagne (c. 800) contains five out of the fifteen; but four of these represent the interchanges between Jerome and Damasus which form a unit, so that the similarity is even less than the figures suggest.

² The Vespasian Psalter has a picture of David on an inserted leaf at Ps. 26, interesting because its Italian manner contrasts with the Celtic style of the figure-drawing in the Book of Cerne. But there is no reason why Elmham should notice it: he did not describe the body of the psalter, and a portrait of David is common in psalters.

³ Here Dr. Kuhn gives another explanation that may cause confusion. After quoting the sentence that has been given above, he goes on (pp. 601 f.): 'The "other Psalter previously mentioned" is a reference to the first of Elmham's two Gregorian Psalters, which apparently contained the same hymns as the Psalter now under consideration. To complete his description of the second [psalter] we must therefore include his enumeration of the hymns which are appended to the first.' Thus a list of sixteen hymns is obtained of which only the three specified by Elmham are in the Vespasian Psalter.

concealing their presence' (p. 602). Sweet, too, forgot that Elmham did not share his interest in Old English. Nor was he making a catalogue of the contents of the manuscripts. He was writing an account of the books supposed to have been given to the Abbey by Augustine, and many, perhaps all of them, were believed to have been sent to Augustine by Gregory the Great. The parts in rustic capitals and uncials, which he could easily distinguish and understand, had the appearance of great age: their antiquity and Roman character impressed Leland when he saw the same psalter before the Dissolution. But Elmham knew that Old English glosses and additions in late Caroline minuscule could not be part of the 'Gregorian' book, and he very properly omitted them as irrelevant to his purpose.

Then the experts in manuscripts and their histories are right in identifying Elmham's second psalter with Vespasian A 1. The contents of Vespasian A 1 nowhere conflict with the many positive statements in his description, and sufficient reasons can be given for any differences. This conclusion weakens Dr. Kuhn's general thesis, but is not decisive against it. The honour given to the Vespasian Psalter at St. Augustine's in the early fifteenth century—it lay on the high altar—raises a strong presumption that it belonged to the Abbey before the Conquest: after that date there was no reason to acquire a version of the psalms which had gone out of use, with an unintelligible Mercian gloss.¹ As we go back to earlier centuries the presumption becomes progressively weaker: the Psalter may have been brought to Canterbury so early that its place of origin was forgotten. Still, anybody who maintains that it was not written at Canterbury, or that it was written at another place he can name, has the task of showing that probability is on his side: in such a matter strict proof is not to be expected.

II. Evidence from Ornamentation

For the ornamentation of the five manuscripts, Dr. Kuhn depends on two authorities, Westwood² and Zimmermann,³ and uses their work for a single purpose: as proof that all five are so closely related in ornament that they must have been produced at one place.⁴ If this is accepted as

¹ Dr. Kuhn says (p. 600) that 'many fine manuscripts which had been written elsewhere gravitated to Canterbury, especially from the eleventh century on'; but he gives no example, and M. R. James, in his *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, mentions no manuscript from early Anglo-Saxon times that reached Canterbury after the Norman Conquest.

² J. O. Westwood, *Facsimiles of the Miniatures in Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.* (London, 1868).

³ E. H. Zimmermann, *Vorkarolingische Miniaturen* (Berlin, 1916).

⁴ See his p. 591. For Royal 1 E vi only the evidence of ornament is used, and he concludes: 'All that one can say with any confidence is that the provenience of this manuscript is the same as that of the other products of its school' (p. 613).

proved, evidence for the localization of any one of the five is evidence for them all. But it is neither proved nor probable.

Westwood and Zimmermann both noted points of resemblance in the ornamentation of the five manuscripts, yet they differed radically in the interpretation. Westwood supposed that the Vespasian Psalter was written at Canterbury and the Book of Cerne at Lindisfarne; so that for him the stylistic features characteristic of the group were to be found from one end of England to the other. Zimmermann's opinion is based on the Vespasian Psalter, the Golden Gospels, and the Royal Gospels. Briefly his argument runs: That these three manuscripts were all in Canterbury libraries is not enough in itself; but since they are closely related in style of ornament, and that style is clearly distinguished from the contemporary Northumbrian, the inference that we have to do with local [i.e. Canterbury] production should not be regarded as too venturesome.¹ He finds that the other two manuscripts, Tiberius C II and the Book of Cerne, resemble the first three in the style of their ornament; and although he notes considerable differences in the Book of Cerne, he assigns them also to the 'Canterbury School' and to Canterbury itself. The first part of his argument has been generally regarded as successful or at least tenable, for Canterbury at that period was the chief centre of culture south of the Humber. But no independent authority, I believe, accepts the attribution of Tiberius C II and the Book of Cerne to Canterbury.²

Zimmermann, whose pioneer survey is full of new suggestions and comparisons, would probably expect his readers to have in mind some causes of uncertainty that could not be mentioned in every detailed discussion. No special knowledge is required to appreciate the difficulty of distinguishing books produced at a great centre like Canterbury from those produced at other places under its influence; or of deciding exactly at what point in the balance of resemblances and differences two books should be assigned to the same rather than to different scriptoria.

There is another consideration. An expert in ornament may be able, very exceptionally, to say that the same artist worked on two extant manuscripts; but he cannot say exactly when or where a manuscript was produced unless it contains words or marks that give the information. Failing these, by reference to other comparable manuscripts in which this kind of information is given, he can construct a hypothetical scheme of local and

¹ Op. cit., p. 131.

² See, for example, Sir Thomas Kendrick, *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900* (London, 1938), pp. 159 ff. He distinguishes the Book of Cerne sharply from the rest, notes 'barbaric' and even Northumbrian features in its ornament, and calls it 'the first indubitably Mercian MS.' He inclines to a Mercian origin for Tiberius C II. For the latter, see Lowe, op. cit., no. 191: 'written probably in the South'.

chronological development, into which the manuscript under investigation may be fitted. A considerable margin of error is inevitable in this procedure. It should be least where the number of fixed points in the conjectural scheme of development is greatest.

In the eighth and early ninth centuries English scribes, both men and women, were producing books at many places, to meet home needs, to support the German mission, to supply France and Italy with learned and religious works. Few of these books survive, and not all of them contain notable ornament. By fortunate chances two magnificent Northumbrian books can be localized exactly and dated within a generation: the Lindisfarne Gospels were written at Lindisfarne by Aldfrith who was bishop there from 698 to 721, and the great uncial Codex Amiatinus at Florence was one of three bibles written at Jarrow under Abbot Ceolfrith (690-716). But it is hard to find one early ornamented book for which an English scriptorium south of the Humber can be named with fair certainty, or a close date given. In this area and period the study of ornament can offer valuable suggestions, but, lacking fixed points of reference, it cannot supply other studies with dates or localizations that are close and sure. The same difficulties affect the evidence of handwriting, though in a less degree. So before dealing with arguments from it, let us see what independent evidence of their place of origin the five manuscripts contain.

III. Evidence from Content

THE VESPASIAN PSALTER. Elmham's evidence has already been discussed. Thompson thought that the 'Roman' text of the psalter was an additional reason for assigning it to Canterbury.¹ Dr. Kuhn dissents (pp. 608 f.), noting from Bishop and Gasquet² that Bede (d. 737) used the Roman text in his sermons. Here the date of the Vespasian Latin text is important. Thompson and Warner¹ adopt the date 'c. 700' or 'early eighth century' which has been traditional since Wanley first gave it. Before 700 the Roman text was certainly characteristic of Canterbury and probably uncommon in Northumbria: the Irish missionaries seem to have favoured the Gallican text, so that when Wilfrid came to Canterbury about 650 he had to learn the Roman psalter instead of the Gallican he had known in Northumbria.³ Dr. Kuhn (p. 611) prefers Zimmermann's date, the third quarter of the eighth century, by which time the use of the Roman text seems to have

¹ *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the British Museum*, ii, p. 11; *Schools of Illumination*, i (1914), description of pll. 6 and 7.

² *The Bosworth Psalter* (1908), p. 7. These authors accept the early date and Canterbury origin of the Vespasian Psalter.

³ Eddi's *Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1927), ch. iii; quoted by Bishop and Gasquet, loc. cit.

become general in England. Neither date is likely to be proved or disproved. In his dating of the Vespasian Psalter, Dr. Lowe is not prepared to be more precise than 'eighth century',¹ and for most of that century Canterbury had no monopoly of the Roman text. So the Latin text throws no clear light on provenance.

ROYAL I E VI, a gospel book, written late in the eighth century, also belonged to St. Augustine's towards the end of the Middle Ages. It bears the inscription *Liber Sancti Augustini Cantuariensis* with a press-mark, in a fourteenth-century hand; and it is probably a volume detached from a 'Gregorian' bible which Elmham describes.² For its earlier history the same presumptions apply as for the Vespasian Psalter.³ Dr. Kuhn's only specific objection to Canterbury origin has no force. The volume is decorated with four leaves (there were once more) of purple and rose vellum. Noting that purple vellum was used in royal books in Carolingian times, he passes to the assumptions that purple vellum indicates royal ownership (pp. 587 f., 613); that the eighth-century kings of Kent were too poor to indulge in such a luxury; and therefore this manuscript is not likely to have been produced at Canterbury: rather, it would suit the great Mercian king Offa (757-96). Except that their kingdom was relatively rich in agriculture and trade, nothing is known of the finances of the eighth-century kings of Kent, or of the extra cost of purple vellum in their day.⁴ But speculation is unnecessary. Service books on purple vellum suited the Anglo-Saxon taste for splendid ornament in their churches. Eddi records that St. Wilfrid (before 678?) ordered the four gospels 'to be written in letters of gold on purple vellum, and gave this 'marvel of beauty hitherto unheard of among us' to his new church at Ripon 'for the adornment of the house of God'.⁵ There is no reason to think that in the eighth century purple vellum was beyond the resources of archbishops of Canterbury, abbots of St. Augustine's, and other heads of great churches.

THE GOLDEN GOSPELS. The same objection is made (p. 598) to a Canterbury origin of the Stockholm Golden Gospels, which has many purple leaves

¹ Op. cit., no. 193.

² See *Catalogue of Ancient MSS. in the British Museum*, ii, p. 22.

³ The suggestion (p. 613) that the late pressmark indicates recent acquisition may be dismissed: there was no reason why such a book should be acquired in the late Middle Ages. Up-to-date pressmarks would be added to old possessions when a library was reorganized. None, I believe, of the St. Augustine's marks goes back to Anglo-Saxon times, and the elaborate classification by presses (assigned to subjects) and shelves is a later development. See p. 4, n. 1 above.

⁴ Before it reached Lichfield in the tenth century, St. Chad's gospel codex was exchanged in Wales for a 'fine horse', and this gives some idea of the value of a handsome early gospel-book. St. Chad's Gospels has no purple leaves, but the extra cost of decorating with leaves of tinted vellum could hardly be more than the value of another fine horse.

⁵ Ed. Colgrave, ch. xvii.

and lavish gold ornament.¹ But here there are other reasons for doubt. An Old English inscription² records that Alderman Ælfred and his wife Werburg bought it from a Danish invading force (*æt haeðnum herge*) because, among other reasons, 'we were unwilling that it should remain longer with heathens' (*in ðære haeðnesse*); and that they gave it to Christ Church, Canterbury.³ Alderman Ælfred's will,⁴ made between 871 and 888, shows that his lands were in Surrey and Kent. In his time the Danes were very active in south-eastern England. The Chronicle at 865 reports that the men of Kent paid the invaders to leave them in peace; and in such negotiations all the parties to the redemption of the Golden Gospels were likely to meet. Dr. Kuhn makes the point that an inscription so circumstantial could not fail to mention restoration if the Danes had previously looted the book from Christ Church itself.⁵ The question where they got it is unanswerable: a fine gospel-book was fairly portable, but it was also easy to sell. In the circumstances it is rather more likely to have been looted in the south-east by the army engaged there than to have been carried all the way from Lichfield in search of a buyer.

MS. TIBERIUS C II is an important witness to the text of Bede's *History*. Plummer⁶ noted two indications in its Preface. For *meditandum* in the opening paragraph it has the very rare bad reading *meditaturum*, and Simeon of Durham in his *Gesta Regum* quotes the passage with *meditaturum*. This is evidence that Tiberius C II, or a closely related lost manu-

¹ My recollection of this manuscript is not fresh, but I have the impression that some of the gold leaf that is flaking off was applied at a later date in an attempt to enrich the book. Beside the inscription recording Ælfred's and Werburg's gift is another asking prayers for Ceolheard, Niclas, Ealhun, and Wulfhelm *aurifex*; and these, I suppose, are the names of the men who put the codex in order when it was given to Christ Church: its binding had probably been stripped off by the Danes. Dr. B. J. Timmer has drawn my attention to a critique of Professor Kuhn's views, with special reference to the Golden Gospels, by C. Nordenfalk, *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, xxxviii (1951), 145 ff.

² Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 175; F. E. Harmer, *Select English Historical Documents* (Cambridge, 1914), no. ix; D. Whitlock, *English Historical Documents*, i (London, 1955), no. 98.

³ An attempt is made (p. 593) to tip the scale in favour of Mercia and Lichfield by a new interpretation of *in ðære haeðnesse*, which has hitherto been rendered 'among heathens', 'in heathen hands'. Elsewhere in OE. *hæðenes* means 'heathenry', but in ME. it means vaguely 'heathen lands'. Dr. Kuhn, who reports Bosworth-Toller inaccurately, takes it here to mean specifically 'heathen territory in England', and supposes that Alderman Ælfred saw the book on a journey to territory ruled by the Danes. That he should make such a journey, taking his wife as the text would imply, is possible but not probable. It is doubtful whether any Anglo-Saxon before or soon after the Treaty of Wedmore thought of the area around Lichfield as heathen territory; but in any case the objection was not to the gospel book being in heathen territory, but in the control of heathens and exposed to desecration.

⁴ Ed. Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 451; Harmer, *op. cit.*, no. x; Whitlock, *op. cit.*, no. 97.

⁵ W. M. Lindsay in *Classical Quarterly*, v (1911), 45, noted inscriptions in which the restoration of a manuscript is expressed as if it were a gift, but they are not quite parallel.

⁶ *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica* (Oxford, 1896), i, pp. xciii f.

script, was at Durham in the early twelfth century. Again, *nostro* has been added later after *antistite* in the phrase *de sancto patre et antistite Cudbercto*. This is evidence that the manuscript was in a place which counted St. Cuthbert in its series of bishops (*antistites*). Mr. Neil Ker has kindly looked at the addition for me in order to form an opinion of its date; and, with the reservations necessary when dating such a tiny scrap, he thinks it is not much later than the manuscript itself, say, not much later than 800. If so Tiberius C II was probably at Lindisfarne before 875, when Cuthbert's body was removed from there; and it might later reach Durham where his relics found their last home in 995. If it is thought better to exclude a debatable and disconcerting palaeographical argument at this stage, *nostro* is still evidence that the book was in eastern Northumbria at some time before the Norman Conquest.¹ There is no 'independent' evidence that it was ever at Canterbury or Lichfield.

THE BOOK OF CERNE. Cambridge University Library MS. Ll. 1. 10 is a collection of prayers and scriptural extracts for private devotions. The earliest part is assigned by good palaeographical authorities to the first half of the ninth century.² The contents of this part raise delicate problems, and there is a risk that any summary statement will misrepresent the views of the very careful writers to whom I refer. At f. 21^a (not at the beginning of the prayer-book) a Latin acrostic gives the name AEDELVALD EPISCOPUS, and at f. 87^b a selection of verses from the psalms is attributed to 'Oedelwald episcopus'. An Æthelwald was bishop of Lichfield from 818 to 830, near the time when the manuscript is thought to have been produced. But Edmund Bishop, who brought to light the strong Irish element in the contents, preferred to think that both these entries are due to the incorporation of pieces from a *Hymnarius* by Æthelwald, bishop of Lindisfarne 721-40.³ For a strictly linguistic reason, I have ventured to raise an objec-

¹ Dr. Kuhn would have the manuscript written at Lichfield and transferred to Worcester before 900, because he thinks Worcester more convenient for explaining some admixture of West Saxon elements in the glosses (pp. 614, 618). He supposes that a Northumbrian visited Worcester, wrote *nostro* in the manuscript, and perhaps made extracts from it which were taken back to Durham and used by Simeon of Durham. Alternatively, leaving *meditaturum* out of account, he suggests that after St. Cuthbert appeared in a vision to King Alfred before the battle of Ethandun (878), a West Saxon (visiting Worcester?) might think of him as 'our saint and bishop', and so might add *nostro* to the Preface. But the story of St. Cuthbert's appearance to Alfred is a Durham embroidery of his legend found in Simeon's *Historia* (Rolls Series, i. 63) and in the *Historia Cuthberti* (same volume, pp. 231 ff.), but not in Asser, the Chronicle, or Florence of Worcester. See Sir Edmund Craster in *E.H.R.*, lxi (1954), 178, 199.

² H. Bradshaw and Sir George Warner are quoted in *The Book of Cerne*, ed. A. B. Kuypers (Cambridge, 1902), p. xii. Later accretions to the manuscript show that it belonged to Cerne Abbey in Dorset, which was founded about 987, and might acquire the prayer-book at or soon after that date.

³ *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 172-4 and 192-7. The two following references escaped Dr. Kuhn.

tion which applies only to the name in the acrostic: that Æthelwald of Lindisfarne, or a contemporary member of that church, would have spelt the name AEDIL-, and that AEDEL-, fixed by the acrostic, points to the later bishop of Lichfield.¹ Levison has re-examined the matter and suggested ways of accounting for the spelling in the acrostic, without (I think) disposing of the difficulty altogether.² But he has strengthened the case for Bishop's view of a Lindisfarne connexion by showing that 'Alcfrith the anchorite', to whom three prayers are attributed in the Book of Cerne, was a Northumbrian, probably living in the neighbourhood of Lindisfarne about 750. Thus the contents of the Book of Cerne are evidence for a Lichfield connexion only if Bishop's view is rejected, or so modified that one or both the names AEDELVALD, *Oeðelwald* refers to the bishop of Lichfield. And even then such evidence for a connexion is not the same thing as evidence that the book was produced at Lichfield.

To sum up so far. There is no certain evidence of the place at which any of the five manuscripts was written. Zimmermann 'anchored' his non-Northumbrian school of ornament at Canterbury, the greatest cultural centre south of the Humber, because the Vespasian Psalter and the Royal Gospels were among the remarkable collection of ancient books belonging to St. Augustine's at the end of the Middle Ages, and because there is a fair chance that the Golden Gospels were looted by the Danes in that neighbourhood. There are indications that Tiberius C II was in east Northumbria fairly early. The Book of Cerne stands away from the rest in many respects; no authority except Zimmermann has connected it with Canterbury; and though the precise evidence is disputed, there is a fair chance that it is connected with Lichfield.

To be concluded

¹ *Cynewulf* (British Academy, 1933), reprinted in *Studies in the History of OE. Literature* (Oxford, 1953), p. 25 n. The local and chronological evidence for the general rule is discussed there, pp. 3-6. The Lindisfarne *Liber Vitae* does not include bishops, but other early documents confirm the rule in this particular case. The name of the bishop of Lindisfarne is spelt with -il- in Bede's *History* (twice), in its Continuation at 740, in the Mercian MS. Vespasian B VI written about 812, and thrice in late tenth-century entries in the Lindisfarne Gospels. If the *Ymnarius Edilwaldi* of the Fulda Catalogue is his work, the spelling presumably reflects an eighth-century original. The name of the bishop of Lichfield is always spelt with -el-, e.g. four times in contemporary charters (Sweet, *O.E.T.*, nos. 55-58) and once in a ninth-century addition to Vespasian B VI (Sweet, p. 168).

On the evidence of Bede and of the contemporary charters, both bishops were called *Æthilwald* or *Æthelwald*, not *Oethilwald* or *Oethelwald*, which is very different philologically. These two names are often confused by scribes from the early ninth century onwards. The late tenth-century notes in the Lindisfarne Gospels have *Æðilwald*, *Eðilwald*, and *Oeðilwald* for the bishop of Lindisfarne; and *Oeðel-* as well as *Æðel-* appears in undoubted references to the bishop of Lichfield. If *AEDELVALD* and *Oeðelwald* in the Book of Cerne both refer to the latter, it is more likely to be a copy than a book written by or for him; and a copy need not have been produced at Lichfield itself.

² *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 295 ff.

PUNCTUATION IN AN EARLY MANUSCRIPT OF LOVE'S *MIRROR*

By ELIZABETH ZEEMAN

EXCEPT for a few isolated studies, comparatively little has been done in past years to improve our knowledge and understanding of punctuation in medieval English manuscripts. Some recent articles, however, have given fresh impetus towards the remedying of this state of affairs; two, in particular, illustrating mainly from vernacular prose, stress the inaccuracy of the older view that medieval punctuation is, even when full, haphazard and meaningless.¹ In fact it now seems clear that manuscripts of the medieval period may be 'pointed' most carefully according to principles unfamiliar, perhaps, but just as valid as those held today, and that these principles may differ significantly in allowing for oral delivery to a far greater extent than has previously been recognized. Punctuation will at times be less grammatical than rhetorical, directing the lowering or raising of the voice with appropriate pauses, and marking, on some occasions, ornamental devices of sound and rhythm.² The matter has more than a specialist interest: it affects our reading and judgement of vernacular prose style and it may, for the editor of a medieval text, give some contributory information on the quality and grouping of manuscripts.

It is also clear, however, that before final conclusions can be drawn, a good deal of evidence must be collected from manuscript copies of medieval texts differing as widely as possible in subject-matter and style. This article sets out to describe and discuss the system of punctuation used by the writer of the Cambridge University Library manuscript Additional 6578—an early fifteenth-century copy of Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ*. Translated from the Latin of the pseudo-Bonaventuran *Meditationes Vitae Christi* before 1410, and in that year licensed by Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury for devout reading, Love's *Mirror* became the most widely read Life of Christ of the century.³ MS. Addit. 6578 belonged to the Carthusian House of Mount Grace in

¹ See M. Morgan, 'A Treatise in Cadence', *M.L.R.*, xlvii (1952), 156-64 and P. Clemoes, 'Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts', *Occasional Papers Printed for the Department of Anglo-Saxon*, i (Cambridge, 1952).

² The connexion of certain marks of punctuation with the lowering or raising of the voice was noticed by Luick in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, xxiii (1912), 228, where he dealt with the prose of the Early Middle English Saints' Lives of the Katherine group. The two articles referred to above investigate and develop the matter more fully.

³ Thirty-eight MSS. are known to exist; it was first printed in 1486 and seven more editions followed before 1530. The modern edition, by L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1908), is based on a collation of three of the MSS., and has purely editorial punctuation. On Nicholas Love and the *Mirror of the Blessed Life*, see my article 'Nicholas Love—a Fifteenth-Century Translator', *R.E.S.*, n.s. vi (1955), 113-27.

Yorkshire, of which Love was prior from 1410 to 1421, and on textual and linguistic grounds appears to be a most reliable manuscript.¹ It is remarkable among copies of the *Mirror* for the fullness and, on closer scrutiny, the good sense of its punctuation, seeming to reveal a consistent procedure of great general interest. The following analysis is based on a study of the Passion section of the *Mirror*.

Four main punctuation marks are used:

- (.) The simple point—this is placed fairly low and does not seem to vary in position.
- (;) The so-called 'inverted semicolon', or the *punctus elevatus*.²
- (?) The interrogation mark.
- (/) or (¶) The paragraph or 'sense unit' sign.³

No other marks occur except (/) which indicates that a word has been broken by the ending of a line in the manuscript. Capital letters nearly always begin a new sentence and always occur after the sign (/) or (¶).

All these signs are used frequently and methodically to mark out what seem to be patterns of a grammatical and rhetorical nature. We are reminded here of Love's avowed purpose in the work of translation: he anticipates both private reading and reading to others, addressing himself to 'every devoute creatour that loveth to rede or to here this book'.⁴ From these words alone, it might not be unreasonable to expect that punctuation, if provided by Love, would be designed to guide on either occasion.

The interrogation mark is easily distinguished and illustrated; it is carefully formed and used regularly after questions. The simple point never replaces it in this manuscript.⁵ Here, for instance, a lengthy meditation on the sufferings of Christ ends with the appeal

Oo my lorde god. what is all þis? loo penkep þe not her a fulle harde & continuele bitter bataile ¶⁶

¹ It contains, on the first leaf, a very interesting 'caveat': 'Cave de istis verbis gude pro gode item hir pro heere in pluraliter'. It seems that this should be understood as a warning to scribes unfamiliar with some of the linguistic forms in the MS., and that this MS. may be one of the earliest copies of the text, sent from Yorkshire to be approved by Arundel, and then used as an exemplar in the south. References below not otherwise identified are to this MS.

² The sign has this name when it occurs in liturgical notation; see Clemoes, *op. cit.*

³ See A. C. Cawley, 'Punctuation in the Early Versions of Trevisa', *London Mediaeval Studies*, i (1937), 117-18, where the function and identity of these two signs are discussed.

⁴ H. J. Chaytor in *From Script to Print* (Cambridge, 1945) stresses the fact that reading throughout the medieval period, private or public, would have been aloud. It is not possible to discover, from Love's own words, whether he anticipated silent private reading or not. The Latin notice concerning the additions made by Love to the original text speaks, however, of *legenti sive intuenti*. It is obvious that rhetorical pointing would have most value for those reading the *Mirror* to others, but would certainly not be wasted on the private reader, silent or otherwise.

⁵ In many other fifteenth-century MSS. of the *Mirror* the point does, in fact, serve as interrogation mark. ⁶ f. 89 b.

Oo Jone. where is now my dere sone þat so hie speciale affeccioun hade to þe?
 Oo maudeleyne where is þi maister þat so tendirly louede þe. & þu so gladly
 seruedest him? Oo my dere sistres where is now my sone?¹

The paragraph or sense-unit mark is also clearly seen and accounted for; it is written, at first, as a double oblique line always following a simple point—thus (./) is the complete sign. In a great many cases the distinctive mark (¶) is then drawn over it, in either blue or red; this has been done fairly frequently in the *Passion* chapters but not so often in the other sections. It is inaccurate to regard this sign simply as the means of indicating the end of a paragraph, for the units it defines are not always paragraphs by modern standards. They are units consisting of one or more sentences, usually complete in meaning but still linked with surrounding material. Thus the whole may sometimes coincide with our accepted notion of a paragraph, but may sometimes cover less than we should require. There can be no doubt, however, that (./) or (¶) marks a significant pause in the flow of the writing, when one idea or portion of narrative or argument has been completed, and some breathing space is needed, perhaps for thought on what has gone before, perhaps for anticipation of what is to come. For it is noticeable that this manuscript, unlike some other manuscripts of medieval prose, never shows the sign within a sentence; it always comes at the end.² On occasion the sign may define the limits of a completed verbal pattern—thus repetition of word or phrase, balance of sentence parts, assonance, rhythmical design, sometimes occur within these 'units'. This does not seem, however, to be the basic condition for the presence of the sign; the rounded sense-unit may naturally carry with it a rounded stylistic pattern, but it is obvious that the primary object of (./) and (¶) is to record some stage in the development of the material. If, in the following extracts, the voice is lowered at the sign (./), and a pause made before taking up the next words, the passages 'read aloud' sensibly and movingly; the pause allows for brief meditation and prepares for a slight shift of attention. The first passage is part of a description of Christ scourged by Pilate; the second is taken from Mary's complaint after the burial of Christ:

//Sopely þe piler þat he was bounden to ʒit schweþ þe steppes of his blode as
 it is contenede in stories.// Take now her gude hede by inwarde meditacioun of
 alle hees peynes abidingly. and bot þu fynde þi herte melte in to sorrowful com-
 passioun. suppose fully and halde þat þu hast to harde a stonene herte.//³

//And how sone alle þese þinges aʒeyns him were done ʒe knowen & seene.//
 Was pere euer any þefe or worst doynge man. so sone dampnet & put to so
 desputese depʒ ffor loo þe last niht he was taken as a thefe. & erly on þe morow

¹ f. 97 a.

² See 'A Treatise in Cadence', p. 162, where examples of the occurrence of the sign within long sentences are given.

³ f. 87 b.

brouht before þe Justice. at tierce dampnet. at sexte on þe crosse hanged. at none dede & nowe biriede.// Oo my dere sonne a bitter departyng was þis. and a sorowful mynde is þis of þine foulest & horrible dep.//¹

Stylistic patterning is to be seen within certain of the 'units' thus marked out; on the other hand, it is clearly not the controlling factor.²

The point is the most frequent mark of punctuation and serves many purposes. From the varied positions in which it occurs, it appears that its function cannot be described in terms of grammar and syntax only. When it is found alone, it seems to demand a pause, but not a long pause. Thus it may separate phrase from phrase, clause from clause, main statement from qualifying clause, or it may end a sentence. The fact that it does not require a very significant pause in reading is shown by its use in a stylized meditation on the sufferings of Christ before the Crucifixion; here brief sentences, each 'enclosed' by the point, are built up one against the other to a climax. The proper effect is to be gained by a steady but swift delivery:

And if þu wolt kawe in what conflicte & bataile he was / beholde & see.// first one despitesly leip hande on him & takeþ him. A noþer is redy & harde byndeþ him. A noþer crynge putteþ upon him blasfeme. A noþer spitteþ in his face. A noþer sotely askeþ of him many questiones in deceite for to accuse him. A noþer is bisy to bring fals wittenes aþeynes him. . . .³

In the following passage the point occupies positions which would be taken, in our strictly grammatical usage, by the comma, the semicolon, and the full stop; it also occupies positions which we should leave unpunctuated. It does not, however, violate grammatical division, even if it fails to differentiate as precisely as we do. More important, it recognizes the general rhythmical make-up of the passage, indicating, whether to those reading privately or to others, the brief pauses in sense and sound necessary for the achievement of total effect:

//And þan at þe bidding of pylate. þat he sholde be scourgete & betene / oure lord was despoilete. bounden to a piler. & harde & sore scourgete. & so stant he nakede before hem alle. þat fairest 3ounge manne of alle childrene þat ever were born. takyng paciently of þoo foulest wrecches. þe hardest & moste bitter strokes of scourges. & so is þat most innocent faireste & clenest flesch. flour of alle mankynde. alle to rente & fulle of woundes. rennyng out of alle sides þat precious kynges blode. and so longe betene & scourgete with wounde upon

¹ f. 97 b.

² Unlike the strongly rhetorical text prose dealt with in 'A Treatise in Cadence', where the sign is sometimes 'an indication of some special rhythmical pattern'.

³ f. 89 a.

wounde. & brisour upon brisour : til boþe þe lokeres and þe smyters were werye.
and þen was he bidene to be unbounden.//¹

The last mark to be considered is (:), the 'inverted semicolon', or *punctus elevatus*, found in many other vernacular texts, as varied as Ælfric's *Homilies*, the early-thirteenth-century *St. Marherete*, the fourteenth-century *Talking of the Love of God*, and Trevisa's *Polychronicon*.² Discussion of the origin and function of this mark has led, it seems, to a measure of agreement; while it appears under certain grammatical conditions, it is frequently used as a direction for reading aloud. Thus it may mark the point at which sense and rhythm demand the raising of the voice and a substantial pause. There is, of course, a strong likelihood from the start that the sign will be able to fulfil both grammatical and rhetorical needs.

In this manuscript of the *Mirror*, (:) occurs less frequently than the simple point, and even a summary glance reveals that it is a far more significant mark. It stands out from the 'unit-sign' by the fact that it is always found within the sentence or sentence group. Generally it draws attention to an important fact or idea, and is sometimes closely associated with a rhythmical or decorative feature of style. In the latter case, however, it remains faithful to grammatical sentence division, here bearing out what has already been said of the function of the point within the sentence. If we look in greater detail at the placing of (:) in MS. Addit. 6578, we find that it may serve a variety of purposes.

It may mark out the main statement of the sentence, usually preceding it, and thus separating it from a qualifying clause or phrase:³

//And forþermore takyng with him hese pre speciale secretaries. þat is to sey.
Peter James & Jone. & tellyng hem þat his herte was hevye & sorowfulle unto
þe dep : badde hem þer abide & wake with him in prayeres.//⁴

Wherefore þu lorde þat seest al þinges : rise in to my helpe & leve me not.⁵

Whoso desireþ with þe apostle poule to be ioyful in þe crosse of oure lorde Jhesus
criste. & in his blessedde passioun : he most with bisy meditacioun abide þere
inne.⁶

¹ f. 87 a. It will be noted that, although the punctuation is not as precise grammatically as ours would be, it is more precise than ours in the matter of rhythm—thus the point at 'þoo foulest wrecches' is accurately placed to obtain the slight but appropriate pause demanded by the sense of the words.

² See, in addition to Morgan, Clemoes, and Cawley, *opp. cit.*, F. Mack, *Seinte Marherete* (E.E.T.S., o.s. cxci, 1934), p. xvii. In the last text, the sign seems to be confused with the mark of interrogation.

³ Cawley, in his analysis of the punctuation of the Trevisa MSS., finds a similar function for (:). See also Clemoes, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

⁴ f. 82 b.

⁵ f. 83 b.

⁶ f. 82 a.

In the following example the sign is used twice, and indicates clearly the relationship of introductory statement to main statement:

And þerwiþ one þat was cleped Longyne. & was þat tyme wikkede & proude. þot after a tréwe lyvere & martir' desipisng hir wepyng & prayeres' with a sharpe spere opunede þe side of our lorde Jhesus. & made a grete wounde. oute of þe which anone ranne to gedir boþe blode and water.¹

But a more interesting view of the sign is gained when we turn to regard the writing primarily as material for reading aloud and examine the possibility that (:) may have not only grammatical but also rhetorical force. For it is clear that, whatever its purely formal position, it has always an intimate connexion with the most significant part of the sentence or sentence group in which it occurs. And if we attach to (:) in this manuscript of the *Mirror* the same value as it has been thought to have in many Latin and vernacular texts of the medieval period—that is, if at (:) we raise the voice slightly and make a substantial pause before proceeding—the results are most satisfactory. This can be illustrated simply from a few passages. In the first Christ is consoled by the Archangel Michael in Gethsemane:

And þan seide þe aungele to him. Beþ now of gude counforte my lorde. and worcheþ manfully. ffor it is semely to him þat is in hye degre' to do grete þinges and worpi. and to him þat is a manful man' to suffir harde þinges. ffor þoo þinges þat bene harde and peynful shole sone passe. and þoo þinges þat bene ioyful and gloriose shole come after.²

Here the two signs have a grammatical function in that they both define the limits of relative clauses which delay the completion of the main statement. But the full emotional and rhythmical power of the passage is brought out if they are treated as guides to the reader on the lines suggested above. For the raising of the voice on 'hye degre' and 'manful man', and the subsequent pauses, stress the importance of the ideas expressed—the high degree and the manfulness of Christ are the theme of the passage, as they are of the whole of this section dealing with the agony in the garden. The signs, as a pair, draw attention also to the strongly balanced structure of the sentence, marked out as it is with two similar rhythmical phrases—'hye degré . . . manful man'—and, by requiring a temporary halt in the flow of the words, they allow the proper sound effect to be made.

The following extract has been quoted earlier to illustrate the function of the point; it contains, in addition, two interesting examples of the use of (:):

//And þan at þe bidding of pylate. þat he sholde be scourgete & betene' oure lord was despoilete. bounden to a piler. & harde & sore scourgete. & so stant he

¹ f. 93 b.

² f. 84 b.

nakede before hem alle. þat fairest ȝounge manne of alle childrene þat ever were born. takyng paciently of þoo foulest wrecches. þe hardest & moste bitter strokes of scourges. & so is þat moste innocent faireste & clenest flesch. flour of alle mankynde. alle to rente & fulle of woundes. rennyng out of alle sides þat precious kynges blode. and so longe betene & scourgete with wounde upon wounde. & brisour upon brisour: til boþe þe lokeres and þe smyters wer werye. and þen was he bidene to be unbounden.//¹

Both marks can be justified grammatically for their position after either a descriptive clause or a phrase. In the larger rhetorical pattern of this highly emotional passage, however, they play a more subtle part. They point, immediately, the two phrases which will bring out sharply the physical horror of the scene—'scourgete & betene', 'brisour upon brisour'. In the first case a fairly long pause after 'scourgete & betene' presses home the full blasphemy of the situation—God scourged by man; in the second case the raised voice and the pause show that the climax of the long catalogue of sufferings has been reached—tension now drops into compassion. It is worth noting here, as in the foregoing extract, the strongly rhythmical nature of the phrases thus 'punctuated' by these signs.²

Both the previous passages have been taken from translated prose; the next passage is part of one of Love's many original additions to the text, and prefaces the Passion section in the *Mirror*. It deals with the need for full realization of the humanity of Christ and therefore of the depth of His sufferings:

//Wherefore þu shalt ymagine & inwardly þenk of him in his passione as of a faire ȝonge man of þe age of . xxxiiȝ ȝere. þat were þe faireste þe wiseste þe moste rihtwise in lyvyng & moste godely & innocent þat ever was or miht be in þis worlde: so falsely accusede. so envyously pursuede. so wrongwisely demede. & so despitely slayne: as þe processe of his passione after telleþ & alle for þi love.//³

Here, without doubt, the primary importance of the two signs is not grammatical, although they occur appropriately enough from the grammatical point of view. Rather they mark significant stages in the argument of the passage—where pause for reflection on what has been said would be desirable, and where, too, a pause would give heightened emphasis to what is yet to come. They mark out a formalized pattern of sense and sound—two contrasted rhythmical 'catalogues', one of the virtues of Christ, the other, ironically, of the injustices done to him by his people. The

¹ f. 87 a.

² Miss Morgan, in 'A Treatise in Cadence', finds that the scribe of one MS. of *A Talking of the Love of God* sometimes places the 'sense unit' mark immediately after a rhythmical phrase which may strongly resemble the Latin 'cursus' forms. The two phrases here quoted could be regarded as fair adaptations of such 'cursus' forms.

³ f. 82 a.

crescendo of meaning and sound to the word 'slayne' is thus conveniently indicated to the reader—whether he is reading for private meditation or for others to hear.

It would not, of course, be possible to make a case for absolute consistency in the punctuation of this manuscript. There are occasions when the system, as defined above, does not seem to be followed accurately. We might have expected, for instance, in the quotation on page 16 that some kind of punctuation mark—the point perhaps—would have been placed after 'harde and peynful' and 'ioyful and glorious'; a reading of the passage demands a slight pause at these positions. Again, the sign (:) is sometimes missed:

//Dis is a piteovouse siht & a ioyful siht. A pitevous siht in him: for þat harde passioun þat he suffred for our savacioun. bot it is a likyng siht to us. for þe matir & þe effecte þat we haue þerbye of our redempcioun.¹

On both grammatical and rhythmical grounds (:) is appropriate at 'to us'. Such examples are, however, surprisingly rare. They may be due to carelessness of author or of scribe, but they do not affect the general conclusion—that here we have a method of punctuation which seems, for the most part, to proceed logically and which, therefore, is likely to represent a genuine usage.

There are not, unfortunately, any certain means of telling whether this was the usage of Nicholas Love. We do know, however, that MS. Addit. 6578 is a reliable early manuscript, written probably at Mount Grace, the author's house.² It is also true to say that the punctuation provides an intelligent commentary on the sense, grammatical structure, and rhythm of the prose. If Love himself was not at work here—either writing or overseeing—he would have had little reason to disapprove of the finished 'pointed' text.

¹ f. 92 b.

² The close connexion of C.U.L. MSS. Addit. 6578 and 6686 can be argued on grounds of punctuation as well as on those of text and language. It seems reasonable to suppose, however, that punctuation will be of limited value for manuscript work. As A. C. Cawley pointed out, *op. cit.*, we should not expect to find standardized systems of punctuation in medieval manuscripts, but rather numerous systems, consistent within themselves, varying from author to author or scribe to scribe. We might expect that MSS. written in the same monastery would use similar systems; here it is interesting to note that MS. Porkington 19 (National Library of Wales) of the *Seven Points of True Love and Everlasting Wisdom*, which was *scriptum finaliter* in Mount Grace in 1419, is punctuated quite fully, and with the signs discussed above.

THE ANSWER-POEM OF THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By E. F. HART

ONE of the most characteristic poetic productions of the first forty years of the seventeenth century was the answer-poem. The modest demands it made on the writer's poetic ability—in common with other forms of parody—naturally recommended it to the gentlemanly amateur in an age when lyric and song were fashionable, yet it was not altogether disdained even by the greater poets.

Before distinguishing the various forms the answer-poem took at this time it will be as well to describe its general nature. For this purpose Marlowe's celebrated 'Come live with me, and be my love' and Raleigh's equally celebrated reply, which first appeared together in *Englands Helicon*, 1600, would seem very appropriate. The wit, beauty, and fame of these two poems must have added zest to the taste for writing answers which grew steadily throughout the first decades of the century. But they are Elizabethan in style, and lack the note of intimacy that is a feature of the true seventeenth-century lyric and its answer. A more representative pair, which must have appeared soon after the accession of James I, is Sir Robert Ayton's 'I lov'd thee once, I'll love no more', and its answer, written, so we are told, by the poet himself at the King's command. They are love-poems like the Marlowe-Raleigh pair, but their treatment of love is different. They are more direct and realistic, but also more self-conscious; as often with the love-lyrics of the early seventeenth century, one suspects that they may owe more to their poet's artistry than to his passion. In the first poem Ayton upbraids his mistress for her inconstancy and announces his indifference to her charms; in the second, addressed to himself, he argues that if inconstancy in his mistress is a bad thing, it would be equally bad for him to abandon her. It is a singularly unconvincing thesis, as Ayton himself probably felt; certainly the first poem is much the more spirited of the two. But this is not the point. The point lies in the wit, neatness, and courtly elegance with which Ayton was able to turn the tables on himself—and all at the King's command. The reader may gauge the style and tone of these poems from their first two stanzas:

I lov'd thee once, I'll love no more,
Thine be the grief, as is the blame,
Thou art not what thou wast before,
What reason I should be the same?

Thou that lov'd once, now lov'st no more,
For fear to show more love than brain,
With heresy unhatched before,
Apostacy thou dost maintain.

He that can love unlov'd again,
Hath better store of love than brain;
God send me love my debts to pay,
Whilst unthrifths fool their love away.

Nothing could have my love o'erthrown,
If thou had'st still continued mine,
Nay, if thou had'st remain'd thine own,
I might perchance have yet been thine.
But thou thy freedom did recall,
That it thou might elsewhere enthrall,
And, then, how could I but disdain
A captive's captive to remain?

Can he have either brain or love,
That doth inconstancy approve?
A choice well made, no change admits,
And changes argue after-wits.

Say that she had not been the same,
Should thou therefore another be?
What thou in her as vice did blame
Can that take virtue's name in thee?
No, thou in this her captive was,
And made thee ready by her glass;
Example led revenge astray,
When true love should have kept the way.¹

These stanzas illustrate clearly what Suckling later called 'The neat refined language of the court'. One may also detect in them a studied negligence of construction and a polished intimacy of tone that are unmistakable evidence of their aristocratic milieu. They are the work of a fine gentleman. It should be noted that an answer-poem is not necessarily an answer at all; this one of Ayton's is a companion poem in which the poet has wittily given unexpected twists to the key words and phrases of the original, not of course to ridicule them in the way parodies usually do, but for the pleasure afforded by such mental and verbal jugglery. Yet the jugglery is carefully controlled so as to keep the phrasing of the stanzas balanced. It is clear that Ayton intended not only that his poems should be set to music, but also that both should share the same musical setting. They could thus be sung one after another; or together, with the opposite stanzas alternating, so that the finer correspondences of the answer might be better appreciated. These are the chief characteristics of the early seventeenth-century answer-poem.

But not all poetic replies written in the early seventeenth century were answer-poems of this kind. Thus William Habington's 'Against them who lay unchastity to the sex of Women', which is clearly an answer to Donne's bitter 'Goe, and catche a falling starre', is not an answer-poem. It does not employ the close verbal parallelism of the answer-poem, and it is written in a completely different metre from Donne's poem.²

The extraordinary vogue of the answer-poem in Jacobean and Caroline times can only be understood by reference to the social and musical conditions of the age. It could not have flourished as it did at any other period. When this environment changed, the answer-poem, as we shall see, perished.

¹ The poems are printed side by side in the Rev. Charles Roger's *Poems of Sir Robert Ayton* (London, rev. edn. 1871), pp. 60-61. There is a setting of 'I lov'd thee once' by Henry Lawes in Playford's *Treasury of Musick*, 1669 (Book II, p. 30) from which I have incorporated two small variants in the text of the first stanza.

² See also the anonymous 'Go, Echo of the minde' in Miss Agnes Latham's *Poems of Sir Walter Ralegh* (London, 1951), pp. 135-7.

The social background of the answer-poem, being the same as that of contemporary literature as a whole, has often been described. It centred on the court. The courts of James I and Charles I, so different in many ways, were alike in that they fostered learning and the arts. Their peculiar blend of intimacy and formality, especially when refined and intensified by Charles, tended to encourage the more precious kinds of art, like the masque; the answer-poem also thrived in this atmosphere. The reader may remember that it was hearing an answer-poem of Lucy Apsley's at the court of the young princes at Richmond in 1637 that helped John Hutchinson to make up his mind to meet her. But it was not only at court that the arts were valued. In an age when the ideals of Castiglione had not been forgotten, the long years of peace enabled the owners of country houses, great and small, to develop a rich cultural life of their own. There is plenty of evidence that many of them did so. The exclusiveness of these little communities was akin to that of Whitehall; it is often revealed in dedications, such as that by John Danyel of his *Songs for the Lute Viol and Voice*, 1606. Nor is it without significance for us that his opening song is a setting of a poem and its answer.

The answer-poem was also moulded by its musical environment. If we may attribute the intimacy of tone and delicacy of workmanship found in Jacobean and Caroline lyrics and their answers to their aristocratic milieu, we must also acknowledge that the filigree exactness with which the answers mirrored the words, phrases, rhythms, and metres of their originals was due to the influence of contemporary music. In the early years of the seventeenth century the great madrigal-composers were still producing masterpieces, but their art was becoming outmoded; simple part-songs or solos with lute accompaniment, usually known as 'Ayres', were replacing madrigals in popular favour. From the poet's point of view such settings had a great advantage over the madrigal in that they allowed his words to be heard better. And while madrigals, owing to their contrapuntal nature, could only be sung to the words round which they were composed, the strophic tune of an 'ayre' could be repeated as often as required for successive stanzas of the same poem. Side by side with this purely musical development there was a marked improvement in another aspect of the art of coupling words and notes lovingly together, to use a phrase of Campion's, to whom much of the credit for the improvement is due. In a general way all lyric verse before Donne's was suitable for music, yet in small points of detail successive stanzas of the same poem often differed. It is not uncommon to find in Dowland's songs, for instance, that the music of the first stanza does not fit the others without some crude adaptation such as stretching a syllable over two or more notes, or repeating words. But in Campion's songs one finds not only an exact metrical equivalence between

all the stanzas of the same poem, but equivalence of phrasing as well. The perfection of his work was not lost on his contemporaries or on the succeeding generation of lyric poets. During the second decade of the century a new development took place which placed lyric poetry in an even more favourable position. The recently invented Italian art of solo recitative was then being introduced into England. It was quickly accepted in court circles, so that by the reign of Charles I it had become the only fashionable method of setting lyrics to music. What was more, fashion decreed that a musical setting was essential for all lyrics. The aim of Henry Lawes and the other exponents of this style was 'to shape *Notes* to the *Words* and *Sense*'¹ of the poems they were setting, to impose no musical pattern on their words, but merely to translate them, as it were, into their corresponding musical sounds. The approval with which Caroline poets regarded these methods is expressed again and again in the numerous complimentary poems they wrote to Lawes and his followers.

Yet the very circumstances that favoured their birth doomed most answer-poems to an ephemeral existence. It can only have been the fortunate few that were preserved in manuscripts or got into print; the majority must have disappeared, just as Lucy Apsley's answer has. For once they had served their purpose—to grace an occasion, perhaps, or to compliment one's mistress, to provide another stanza for a well-loved song, or a light-hearted riposte to the poem of the moment, or simply to act as an outlet for youthful exuberance—why should anyone remember them? As for those we still possess, they reveal to us only their literary qualities; the personal motives that led to their being written remain unknown, unless they happen to be lit up by a chance phrase in a title or elsewhere, such as 'at the King's Command' in the case of Ayton's poem. And as we now come to distinguish the different types of answer-poem, we must bear in mind that these poems are really as dead as butterflies in a cabinet. Even so we may admire their exquisite tints, and form some idea of the beauty and graciousness of the environment in which they once lived.

The largest class of answer-poems is naturally what we may call the answer proper, in which the theme or arguments of a poem are criticized as a whole, or (more usually) refuted one by one. The comment sometimes amounts to gentle satire, but it never goes beyond the bounds of friendly chaff. The classic example of this type of answer is Sir Toby Matthew's 'Say but did you love so long' in reply to Suckling's merry outburst 'Out upon it I have lov'd / Three whole days together'. Suckling's poem is a splendid piece of amatory bluff: Matthew's answer quietly calls his bluff and reproves him with mock-seriousness for his 'constant Folly'. It was more usual, however, for the lover to be answered as by his mistress. 'Out

¹ A phrase of Lawes's, from his preface to *The Second Book of Ayres and Dialogues*, 1655.

upon it' was set to music by Henry Lawes, and 'Say but did you love so long' could be sung to the same tune. A few answer-poems belonging to this group were evidently not meant for music, though otherwise conforming to the regular pattern. Such are Waller's 'In Answer to Sir John Suckling's Verses', and Cowley's and Crashaw's poems entitled 'For Hope', both answering Cowley's 'Against Hope'. But these are serious exercises in poetic debate with loftier aims than those of the elegant trifles we are discussing. Not infrequently the answer does not refer directly to its original (as in the previous examples), but merely presents an opposite point of view. The symmetrical pairing of antithetic poems evidently appealed to early seventeenth-century taste, as we may see from Milton's 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso', to mention no others. A good instance of this at the answer-poem level is Thomas Stanley's 'Wert thou by all Affections sought', which answers M. W. M.'s 'Wert thou yet fairer then thou art'. Instead of argument these poems offer us a series of delicately balanced antitheses all turning on the point that 'M. W. M.' loves his mistress because she loves him whereas Stanley loves his because she denies him. Palinodes may also be included here. Ayton's 'Thou that lov'd once' belongs to this small group, of which probably the most beautiful is Stanley's 'Beauty, thy harsh imperious chains', written in answer to his own 'The Return'. Two illustrations must suffice for this very varied category of answer-poems.

The first is an anonymous answer to Herrick's 'Gather ye Rosebuds while ye may'.¹

Rose-buds that's gath'ed in the Spring
 Can't be preserv'd from dying:
 And though yo' enjoy the wisht-for Thing,
 The pleasure will be flying.
 The glorious Lamp that mounteth high,
 And to his Noon arriving,
 Must not stay there continually,
 But downwards will be driving.
 The last is best, for though that Time
 With Age and Sickness seize us;
 Yet on our Crutches do we climb
 Unto a height shall ease us:
 Then though I may, yet will I not
 Possess me of 't, but tarry;
 He lives the best that hath forgot
 What means your word, *Go Marry*.

¹ It is found, together with Herrick's poem and William Lawes's celebrated setting, on pp. 134-5 of *New Ayres and Dialogues*, 1678. The same poem (with a different setting) appears in John Gamble's *Ayres and Dialogues*, 1659, p. 75. It is there entitled 'The contented Batchelor'. I have adopted some of Gamble's readings in my text of the poem.

My second illustration shows that the courtly art of the answer-poem was sometimes imitated by humbler writers. No one would call Wither a court poet; and the Richard Johnson who wrote a reply to 'Shall I wasting in Dispaire?' was little more than a ballad-writer. 'Master Johnsons answer to Master Withers' was printed in *A Description of Love*, 6th edn., 1629, with Wither's and Johnson's stanzas occurring alternately. Here are the first, second, and fifth stanzas of Johnson's answer:

Shall I mine affections slacke,
Cause I see a womans blacke,
Or my selfe with care cast downe,
Cause I see a woman browne?
Be she blacker than the night,
Or the blackest Jet in sight:
*If she be not so to me,
What care I how blacke she be?*

Shall my foolish heart be brust
Cause I see a woman's curst,
Or a thwarting hoggish nature
Joyned in as bad a feature?
Be she curst or fiercer then
Brutish Beast or Savage Men:
*If she be not so to me
What care I how curst she be?*

Poore, or bad, or curst, or blacke,
I will ne'r the more be slacke;
If she hate me, then believe
She shall die, ere I will grieve:
If she like me when I woo,
I can like and love her too:
*If that she be fit for me
What care I what others be?*

The poem is a good example of the antithetic type of answer, but its bluntness and homeliness differentiate it sharply from the grace and courtliness of the general run of answer-poems.

Another large group of answer-poems consists of imitations. At this period almost every lyric masterpiece seems to have attracted the attention of poets and poetasters who tried to recapture its graces in a poem of their own. Some of the best of these imitations were inspired by Marlowe's 'Come live with me and be my love'. Raleigh's 'If all the world and love were young' is a true reply, as we have noticed, but Donne's 'The Baite', Pembroke's 'Dear leave thy home and come with me', Herrick's 'To Phillis

to love, and live with him', as well as the anonymous 'Come live with mee and be my deare', which follows Raleigh's poem in *Englands Helicon*, are all delightful variations on Marlowe's pastoral theme. In the same way Aurelian Townshend's 'Thou shepherd whose intente eye' was probably intended as an answer to Herrick's 'Among the Mirtles as I walkt'.¹ Sometimes the answer lifts the theme of the original to a higher plane, as does George Herbert's 'A Parodie', which, imitating Pembroke's 'Soules joy, now I am gone', interprets 'Soules joy' in a sense very different from that intended by Pembroke. One of the most frequently imitated poems of the age was Carew's 'Ask me no more where Jove bestowes'; but it so happens that most of those that survive are mock-songs (a category I shall describe later), and the few exceptions, like Patherick Jenkyn's 'Ask me not why the Rose doth fade', are hardly close enough to their original to be called answer-poems. Several close imitations, however, were written of Strode's 'I saw faire Cloris walke alone'. Thomas Philipott's 'Faire Julia sitting by the fire' appears in Ault's *Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, but the following from *Wits Recreations*, 1640 (No. 126), has not, so far as I know, been reprinted:

I saw faire *Flora* take the aire,
When *Phoebus* shin'd and it was faire;
The heavens to allay the heat,
Sent drops of raine, which gently beat:
The sun retires, asham'd to see
That he was barr'd from kissing thee:
Then *Boreas* took such high disdain
That soone he dri'd those drops again:
Ah cunning plot and most divine!
Thus to mix his breath with thine.

A third group is made up of answers which develop or amplify some idea, image, or characteristic feature of rhythm or style in the original poem. They may perhaps be called extension poems. Often they consist of no more than one additional stanza, like that charming addition to 'Take, O take those lips away' which appeared in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother* (v. ii):

Hide, O hide those hills of Snow
Which thy frozen bosome beares,
On whose toppes the Pinkes that grow
Are of those that April weares.

¹ In a note on p. 228 of his *Poems and Masque of Thomas Carew*, 1893, Ebsworth states this as a fact, without, however, quoting any authority for his statement. Apart from the obvious similarity of style and construction in both poems, is there not some authority to be derived from the fact that the two poems appear together on a single page (p. 150), under a single setting, in Henry Lawes's Autograph Manuscript? In this huge compilation of over 300 songs they are the only ones made to share a setting. If Townshend's poem was an answer—and Lawes wrote it underneath Herrick's—the anomaly is explained.

But my poore heart first set free,
Bound in those Icy chaines by thee.¹

Many of the lyrics written at this time were peculiarly susceptible of this kind of treatment, for, consisting merely of a string of conceits, one per stanza, there was no reason why the number of them should not be increased indefinitely. But here a problem may arise. In two contemporary manuscripts there is an extra stanza to 'Ask me no more where Jove bestowes', and *Parnassus Biceps*, 1656, contains (pp. 34-35) two new stanzas to Wotton's 'You meaner Beauties of the Night'. The former has been printed by Rhodes Dunlap,² but one of the latter deserves to be quoted:

Ye glorious trifles of the East,
Whose estimation fancies raise,
Pearls, Rubies, Saphirs, and the rest
Of precious Gems, what is your praise
When as the Diamond shewes his raise?

The problem is this: are we to regard these stanzas as evidence of Carew's and Wotton's use of the file (the commonly accepted view), or as being fragments of answer-poems of the extension type? There is much to be said on both sides. Probably the best and clearest example of this kind of answer is afforded by 'Like as the Damaske Rose you see', which was first printed in or just before 1628. The anonymous author of the original stanzas had the satisfaction of inspiring King (or Francis Beaumont), Quarles, William Browne, Strode, and others to write extensions of his theme. The earliest extant version of the poem consists of six stanzas, but it is possible that some of these are really extensions. Certainly the earliest contemporary manuscript³ to give the poem with its musical setting only contains two stanzas—the first and the palinodic sixth stanza—but the poem is quite complete in this form and typically symmetrical. And here I should point out that though the poem owed its popularity mainly to its serious subject and its torrent of similes, yet some of its appeal must have come from the beautiful and expressive tune to which Henry Lawes set it.⁴

¹ The play was printed as a quarto in 1639 and 1640. In the latter year the song was reprinted in *Poems: Written by Wil. Shake-speare. Gent.*, sig. K6. This is the text I have reproduced (with one correction). A setting of the song by Dr. John Wilson was first published in Playford's *Select Muscicall Ayres and Dialogues*, 1652.

² *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (Oxford, 1949), p. 264.

³ MS. 87, Christ Church, Oxford. This musical setting was published by Peter Warlock in *Four English Songs of the Early Seventeenth Century*, 1925. It is also found in the Henry Lawes Autograph Manuscript.

⁴ Campion's 'What if a day, or a month, or a yeare' had an even greater vogue, though at a more popular level. For the extensive bibliography of this poem see Vivian's note in *Campion's Works* (Oxford, 1909), pp. 377-8, and two separate notes by Peter Warlock in *Giles Earle His Booke* (Oxford, 1932), on pp. 124-5 and 134-6. Its tune is printed in Chappell's *Old English Popular Music*, ed. Wooldridge (London, 1893).

'Mock-songs', as they came to be called, comprise the fourth and last kind of answer-poem. Frankly satiric in aim and execution, with no holds barred, they belong mainly to the closing years of the period when the clouds of war began to roll up over peaceful England. Some years before that, however, the potentialities of the mock-song had been admirably displayed in Owen Feltham's stinging 'Come leave this saucy way' in reply to Jonson's ode, 'Come leave the loathèd stage', written in 1629 after the failure of *The New Inn*. By the time of the Scottish war of 1639 the mock-song had come into its own. Suckling's answer, 'I tell thee, fellow, whoe'er thou be', to the witty attack on him in 'Upon Sir John Suckling's Hundred Horse', probably written by Sir John Mennes, shows that the mock-song was beginning to acquire a political bias.¹ Another new development may be detected in the mock-songs of the 1640's: they sometimes exhibit, not personal animosity or political advocacy, but a general spirit of embitterment. The anonymous answer to 'When Love with unconfined wings' that is printed on pages 279-80 of C. H. Wilkinson's *Poems of Richard Lovelace* (Oxford, 1930) is of this kind. Its author had no quarrel with Lovelace—they were both Royalists—but his answer turns Lovelace's idealistic love and loyalty to dust and ashes. Here the political implications of the answer afford some explanation of the act of desecration, but what motive could Cleveland have had for writing his revolting mock-song to his own 'Mark Antony'? As it became even more common in the 1650's, one can only conclude that it was a manifestation of Cavalier frustration and disillusionment after their defeat. Two of the wittiest satires occasioned by the events which led up to the Civil War are 'The Humble Petition of the House of Commons' and its answer, found in *Rump*, 1662 (Part I, pp. 17-21). Though both poems are obviously the work of Royalists, the answer nevertheless exemplifies the political mock-song at its best. The poems consist of eleven stanzas each; these are the first two and the last of them:

*The Humble Petition of the
House of Commons.*

If Charles thou wilt but be so kind
To give us leave to take our mind,
Of all thy store,
When we, thy Loyal Subjects, find
Th'ast nothing left to give behind,
Wee'l ask no more.

First, for Religion, it is meet
We make it go upon new feet,

*The Answer to the
Petition, etc.*

I Charles the King will be so kind
To give you leave to take your mind,
Of all my store,
When I you Loyal Subjects find,
And you those Members have resign'd,
I askt before.

And when Religion's all your cares,
Or London have such heed of theirs,

¹ The two poems are given together in R. G. Howarth's *Minor Poets of the 17th Century* (London, 1931), pp. 242-4. It is unfortunate that he has printed 'Upon Sir John Suckling's Hundred Horse' from manuscript sources; there is a better text of the poem in *Wit and Drollery*, 1656, pp. 44-45, and another (containing a few variants) in *Le Prince d'Amour*, 1660, pp. 148-9.

'Twas lame before:
One from *Geneva* would be sweet,
Let *Warwick* fetch't home with his Fleet,
Wee'l ask no more.

They had before:
When *Warwick* from *Geneva* dares,
Now Printed, bring the Common Prayers,
And read them o're.

Now if that you'll make *Hull* your own,
There's one thing more we must set down,
Forgot before;
Sir *John* shall then give up the Town,
If you will but resign your Crown,
Wee'l ask no more.

Last, when I shall make *Hull* my own,
This one thing more I must set down,
Forgot before,
When I have got into the Town,
I'll make ten more besides that Clown,
Kneele and implore.

With the emergence of the mock-song the answer-poem declined. The mock-song quickly established itself as a powerful weapon of offence in the political controversy and vituperation aroused by the Civil War. The answer-poem was far too delicate to live in such a rending atmosphere. The break-up of the court as well as of the leisured home-life of England destroyed the very foundation on which its intimacy and exclusiveness were built.

We find the same incompatibility between them when we come to examine their intrinsic characteristics. It is an incompatibility of spirit, not of technique, for the mock-song remained true to the answer-poem's close imitation of its original and its affinity to music. But in place of the answer-poem's assertions and protests of love the mock-song substituted propaganda and counter-propaganda; for its idealism and refinement, cynicism and smut; for its friendly raillery, abuse. The mock-song was essentially popular in its appeal, as the answer-poem was essentially aristocratic. This dichotomy exists also in their musical settings. The declamatory style of the Lawes school, which so well set off the verbal and metrical subtleties of Caroline lyrics and answer-poems, lacked the directness and punch required in a mock-song setting. Mock-songs were usually set to broadside-ballad tunes. Thus the Mennes-Suckling pair of poems must have been sung to the well-known tune used for Suckling's 'Ballad upon a Wedding'. And the tune belonging to 'The Humble Petition' and its answer, though not now extant, is mentioned by name in a Restoration drollery.¹

The answer-poem did not return to favour with the resumption of court life in 1660. Charles II, with few of his father's cultural interests, had no wish to reproduce the well-bred exclusiveness of his court. Moreover, England had now become politically conscious, and the second round in the long struggle for power between King and Parliament was just begin-

¹ *Folly in Print*, 1667. On page 41 the song 'Since Cupid thou art grown so kind' is directed to be sung 'To the Tune of Since Fortune thou art [become] so kind', which is the first line of a poem appearing in *Witts Recreations*, 1641, sigs. X3-4. Evidently 'The Humble Petition' is itself an answer-poem (of the imitation type) based on this poem in *Witts Recreations*.

ning. This was no time for the production of courtly love-lyrics and answer-poems. Restoration poetry was to be made of sterner (and grittier) stuff. In the same way Restoration composers were soon to abandon the delicate art of I awes for something more forthright. It is true that in Restoration miscellanies one still comes across an occasional 'Answer', but this usually proves to be either an old poem reprinted, or (more often) a mock-song.

THE 'THREE GLORIOUS VICTORIES' IN *ANNUS MIRABILIS*

By JAMES KINSLEY

THE title and theme of Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis: The Year of Wonders, 1666. An Historical Poem* seem to have been suggested by a series of seditious pamphlets, *Mirabilis Annus, the Year of Prodigies* (1661) and the two parts of *Mirabilis Annus Secundus; or, The Second Year of Prodigies* (1662). They contain accounts of apparitions and prodigies promising 'judgements', in the shape of national disasters, on an iniquitous king and government. These and other publications of the same kind, says Samuel Parker, were 'consulted and perused with no less diligence than the Scriptures themselves'; and they are one form of the seditious activity of disaffected persons who looked forward to the restoration of a commonwealth.¹ The pamphleteers and agitators took advantage of popular interest in prognostications. Nostradamus was known in England, although his *Centuries* was not translated into English till 1672.² He prophesied that

Le sang du juste à Londre fera faute,
Brulez par foudres de vingt trois les six;
La dame antique cherra de place haute,
De mesme secte plusieurs seront occis

and foretold 'la grand peste de cité maritime' and (less explicitly) the naval war of 1665-6 (ii. 51-53). On 3 October 1666, a month after the outbreak of the Great Fire, a Londoner wrote: 'We have now (as tis usual in all extraordinary Accidents) several Prophecies started up: none more remarkable than that of Nostredame'.³ But prophecies of 'a consuming fire . . . which will scorch with burning heat all hypocrites, unstable, double-minded workers of iniquity' were a familiar feature of Puritan pamphlet literature before and just after the Restoration.⁴ Prince Rupert, hearing the news of the Great Fire, remarked only that 'now Shipton's prophecy was out'. In the winter of 1664-5, moreover, comets were seen and occasioned 'mighty talk' in London; and comets were generally held to 'usher in warres, seditions, changes of kingdomes, and the like'.⁵

¹ See J. Walker, 'The Censorship of the Press during the Reign of Charles II', *History*, N.S. xxxv (1950), 219-38.

² James Laver, *Nostradamus* (London, 1952), p. 117; *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth (Oxford, 1927), i. 292-3.

³ Margoliouth, op. cit., i. 292.

⁴ See W. G. Bell, *The Great Fire of London in 1666* (London, 1951), pp. 17-20.

⁵ Pepys, *Diary*, 20 October 1666; *ibid.*, 15 and 17 December 1664; Swan, *Speculum Mundi* (London, 1643), p. 97.

In *Annus Mirabilis* Dryden turns the popular attention away from such prognostications—apparently confirmed in the Plague and the Fire—and from their political implications, towards England's naval victories and the promise of future prosperity. Professor E. N. Hooker has argued convincingly that the poem was designed

to show that the disasters were merely trials (or, if they were allowed to be judgments, then they were judgments upon a people for persisting in their old spirit of rebellion against their rightful sovereign); to show that the disasters were but momentary interruptions in the path to wealth and glory, and that they had served to draw the King and his people together in the bonds of mutual suffering and affection.¹

Dryden steers a cautious course through the events of 1665–6. He ignores the Plague—probably, as Hooker suggests, because it was an 'unmitigated disaster' and the conduct of some in high places had been far from heroic. His account of the Fire contains no reference to the innumerable stories of treason and plot, though even the sensible Pepys gave credence to a rumour which caused much suffering among foreigners in London.² Dryden follows the prudent example of Charles II, who told the homeless citizens that their calamity was 'immediate from the hand of God, and no plot':

[We] conclude the whole was the effect of an unhappy chance, or to speak better, the heavy hand of God upon us for our sins, showing us the terror of his judgment in thus raising the fire, and immediately after his miraculous and never enough to be acknowledged mercy in putting a stop to it when we were in the last despair.³

The brightest omen in this year of wonders, and one which did not require ingenious interpretation, was England's fortune at sea. The naval campaigns against the Dutch were evidence of present power and a promise of mercantile prosperity. They provide a framework for the poem, which opens on the Dutch monopoly in maritime trade, and ends:

Already we have conquer'd half the War,
And the less dang'rous part is left behind:
Our trouble now is but to make them dare,
And not so great to vanquish as to find.

Thus to the Eastern wealth through storms we go;
But now, the Cape once doubled, fear no more:
A constant Trade-wind will securely blow,
And gently lay us on the Spicy shore. (ll. 1209–16)

¹ 'The Purpose of Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, x (1946), 49–67.

² *Diary*, 6 September and 5 November 1666; Bell, op. cit., pp. 191–209.

³ *London Gazette*, No. 85, 3–10 September 1666; Bell, op. cit., pp. 332, 318.

Dryden describes the naval war as

the most heroick Subject which any Poet could desire: I have taken upon me to describe the motives, the beginning, progress and successes of a most just and necessary War; in it, the care, management and prudence of our King; the conduct and valour of a Royal Admiral, and of two incomparable Generals; the invincible courage of our Captains and Sea-men, and three glorious Victories, the result of all.

The engagements which ended in these 'three glorious Victories' aroused great public interest, as Pepys's reports of rumour and criticism show; and there were numerous accounts of the battles.¹ A comparison of *Annus Mirabilis* with more sober narratives shows that, although the poem was written in the country, where Dryden had 'not so much as the converse of any Seaman', it was based on a detailed knowledge of what had passed at sea. But it is called a 'Historical, not Epick' poem only because Dryden judged epic 'too bold a Title for a few Stanza's, which are little more in number then a single *Iliad*': it deals with heroic persons and events in a heroic style. And in poetical description as in portraiture,

the painter will not take that side of the face which has some notorious blemish in it; but either draw it in profile (as Apelles did Antigonus, who had lost one of his eyes,) or else shadow the more imperfect side. For an ingenious flattery is to be allowed to the professors of both arts, so long as the likeness is not destroyed.²

In accordance with the demands of the 'Historique and Panegyrique', which are branches of epic poetry, and in the interests of policy, Dryden passes over incidents which detract from the heroic dignity of his characters and reshapes events to a glorious end.

On 30 May 1665 the Duke of York sailed in command of a large English fleet, and joined battle with Opdam's Dutch fleet, slightly superior in numbers, off Lowestoft on 3 June:

Victorious *York* did, first, with fam'd success,
 To his known valour make the *Dutch* give place:
 Thus Heav'n our Monarch's fortune did confess,
 Beginning conquest from his Royal Race. (ll. 73-6)

Their Chief blown up, in air, not waves expir'd,
 To which his pride presum'd to give the Law:
 The *Dutch* confess'd Heav'n present, and retir'd,
 And all was *Britain* the wide Ocean saw.

To nearest Ports their shatter'd Ships repair,
 Where by our dreadful Canon they lay aw'd:
 So reverently men quit the open air,
 When thunder speaks the angry Gods abroad. (ll. 85-92)

¹ See A. W. Tedder, *The Navy of the Restoration* (Cambridge, 1916), pp. 211-12.

² *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker (Oxford, 1926), ii. 125-6. See James Kinsley, 'Dryden and the Art of Praise', *English Studies*, xxxiv (1953), 57-64.

Soon after the battle Dryden had committed himself to praise of the Duke in 'Verses to her *Highness the Dutchess*', and these stanzas are a further concession to royalty. It was through the tactical skill of Sir William Penn that the Dutch were out-manœuvred in the early stages of the battle. In the *mêlée* that followed, Sandwich's Blue Squadron broke through the enemy line; but whether by accident or design is not clear. Dryden discreetly ignores the English failure to follow up their advantage. During the night of 3 June Brouncker, an officer of the Duke's household, passed on an order which he falsely attributed to James, to shorten sail; and the Dutch escaped. The victory, says Evelyn, 'might have been a complete one, and at once ended the war, had it been pursued, but the cowardice of some, or treachery, or both, frustrated that'.¹

The attention of the navy turned now to two Dutch fleets, De Ruyter's coming home from Guinea and the East India fleet 'fraught with all the riches of the rising Sun'. De Ruyter managed to escape interception; but diplomatic arrangements were made for an English force to attack the East Indiamen while they lay anchored at Bergen, relying on Danish neutrality. The Danish king was to receive a share of the plunder. But the plan misfired. During negotiations between the English admiral and the vacillating Danish governor, the Dutch deployed to advantage; and when firing began, the Danish defences joined with the Dutch and forced the English ships to retire. Dryden misrepresents the balance of forces:

Fiercer then Canon, and then Rocks more hard,
The *English* undertake th' unequal War:
Seven Ships alone, by which the Port is barr'd,
Besiege the *Indies*, and all *Denmark* dare. (ll. 105-8)

The Dutch were nearly forty strong; but the English force which entered the harbour comprised '14 saile and 2 fireships and 4 ketches', although, as the Danish governor protested, only five ships had been agreed on for the attack. The only force of seven ships in the affair was that which the Dutch moored in line across the harbour after the English had withdrawn.² Dryden makes no reference to the conduct of the Danes, and tactfully attributes the English failure to a storm:

And though by Tempests of the prize bereft,
In Heavens inclemency some ease we find:
Our foes we vanquish'd by our valour left,
And onely yielded to the Seas and Wind.
Nor wholly lost we so deserved a prey;
For storms, repenting, part of it restor'd:
Which, as a tribute from the Balthick Sea,
The British Ocean sent her mighty Lord. (ll. 117-24)

¹ *Diary*, 8 June 1665. See Tedder, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-26.

² Tedder, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-39.

He closes the episode with a grave comment on the vanity of human riches, and makes the best of a bad job.¹

On 1 June 1666 De Ruyter, with some ninety ships, anchored midway between Dunkirk and the North Foreland; and George Monk, Duke of Albemarle, sailed to the attack with sixty ships. His own vessel, the *Royal Charles*, suffered heavy damage: 'sailes were torn to y^e yards in peeces, and both flag and ensigne shot downe'. He had so engaged the Dutch fleet that only part of it came into action. Then, despite his punishment, he manœuvred foolhardily to engage the fresh remainder; and 'our whole Navy lay their wanton Mark'.² Dryden says what he can of Albemarle's 'excess of courage', and contrasts English rejoicing and Dutch exhaustion at the end of the day (ll. 273-80). His account of the second day's fighting is brief and vague; but it is adorned with praise of English valour in the face of a numerically superior foe, and with the celebration of Albemarle's heroism and loyalty:

Among the Dutch thus Albemarl did fare:

He could not conquer, and disdain'd to flie.

Past hope of safety, 'twas his latest care,

Like falling *Cesar*, decently to die.

Yet pity did his manly spirit move

To see those perish who so well had fought:

And, generously, with his despair he strove,

Resolv'd to live till he their safety wrought. (ll. 349-56)

He withdraws in good order, and ends the day in musing and heroic resolution:

Yet, like an *English* Gen'ral will I die,

And all the Ocean make my spacious grave.

Women and Cowards on the Land may lie;

The Sea's a Tomb that's proper for the brave. (ll. 401-4)

But much that was to become common knowledge is here passed over, or shrouded in panegyric. 'Many of our shipps being gone, *others not doing their duty*, and the Rest much shattered, it was resolved to make a faire retreat.' Albemarle was not well supported: he 'had Quite Ruined their Fleet . . . if his shipps had don their parts, for he had but 20 of 57 shipps that stucke to him'.³ On 10 June 1666 Pepys

met with Pierce the surgeon, who is lately come from the fleete, and tells me that all the commanders, officers, and even the common seamen do condemn every

¹ Cf. the satirical account of the Bergen affair in 'Directions to a Painter concerning the Dutch War: By Sir John Denham, 1667' (*Poems on Affairs of State*, 1702, pp. 30-31). The Dutch struck medals with the inscription: 'Thus we arrest the pride of the English, who extend their piracy even against their friends, and who insulting the forts of Norway, violate the rights of the harbours of King Frederick; but, for the reward of their audacity, see their vessels destroyed by the balls of the Dutch' (Pepys, *Diary*, 19 August 1665, Wheatley's note).

² 'Directions to a Painter. By Sir John Denham' (*P.O.A.S.*, 1702, pp. 35-36). See Tedder, *op. cit.*, pp. 156, 158.

³ Carte MS. 72; Tedder, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-2.

part of the late conduct of the Duke of Albemarle: both in his fighting at all, in his manner of fighting, running among them in his retreat . . . so as nothing can be worse spoken of. That Holmes, Spragg, and Smith do all the business, and the old and wiser commanders nothing. . . . He says all the fleet confess their being chased home by the Dutch; and yet the body of the Dutch that did it, was not above forty saile at most. . . . He says, however, that the Duke of Albemarle is as high almost as ever, and pleases himself to think that he hath given the Dutch their bellies full, without sense of what he hath lost us; and talks how he knows now the way to beat them. But he says, that even Smith himself, one of his creatures, did himself condemn the late conduct from the beginning to the end.

On 3 June some of Albemarle's ships struck the Galloper shoal; all got off but the *Royal Prince*, which was surrounded and burnt. Sir William Penn told Pepys that 'it was pure dismaying and fear that made them all run upon the Galloper, not having their wits about them; and that it was a miracle they were not all lost'.¹ Dryden ignores this incident, and introduces the shoal only in a compliment to Prince Rupert, who came to Albemarle's relief that afternoon:

The wily *Dutch*, who, like fall'n Angels, fear'd
This new *Messiah's* coming, there did wait,
And round the verge their braving Vessels steer'd,
To tempt his courage with so fair a bait.
But he, unmov'd, contemns their idle threat,
Secure of fame when ere he please to fight:
His cold experience tempers all his heat,
And inbred worth does boasting valour slight. (ll. 453-60)

The battle reopened on 4 June with a series of passes to and fro; and the English, reinforced by Rupert's twenty ships, pressed gradually into the Dutch line from the leeward. But the order was ultimately broken, and the main body of the English fleet found itself between the Dutch centre and the Dutch van and rear forces.² From this action, only the personal exploits of Rupert are selected for praise (ll. 505-32). The Dutch at last moved away under cover of fog; and 'glad to part soe', says Captain Allin, 'we stood over for the English shoar'.³ There was no victory.

. . . a propitious Cloud between us stept,
And in our Aid did *Ruyter* intercept.
Old *Homer* yet did never introduce,
To save his *Heroes*, Mists of better use.
Worship the Sun, who dwell where he doth rise;
This Mist doth more deserve our Sacrifice.
Now joyful Fires, and the exalted Bell,
And Court-Gazettes our empty Triumphs tell.⁴

¹ *Diary*, 4 July 1666. Penn criticized at length 'the whole conduct of the late fight'.

² Tedder, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-5.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁴ 'Directions to a Painter. By Sir John Denham' (*P.O.A.S.*, 1702, p. 38).

'I do find', writes Pepys,

great reason to think that we are beaten in every respect, and that we are the losers. The Prince upon the Galloper, . . . the Essex carried into Holland; the Swiftsure missing (Sir William Berkeley) ever since the beginning of the fight. Captains Bacon, Tearne, Wood, Mootham, Whitty, and Coppin, slayne. The Duke of Albemarle writes, that he never fought with worse officers in his life, not above twenty of them behaving themselves like men . . . [I] went to Westminster Hall, and bought a payre of gloves, and to see how people do take this late fight at sea, and I find all give over the thoughts of it as a victory and to reckon it a great overthrow.¹

Dryden makes no mention of the 'propitious Cloud'. Instead, he underlines the relief of the exhausted Dutch, and takes occasion to add more heroic virtue to his portrait of Albemarle:

This lucky hour the wise *Batavian* takes,
And warns his tatter'd Fleet to follow home:
Proud to have so got off with equal stakes,
Where 'twas a triumph not to be o'r-come. (ll. 533-6)

Albemarle

. . . casts a frown on the departing foe,
And sighs to see him quit the watry field:
His stern fix'd eyes no satisfaction show,
For all the glories which the Fight did yield.
Though, as when Fiends did Miracles avow,
He stands confess'd ev'n by the boastful *Dutch*,
He onely does his conquest disavow,
And thinks too little what they found too much. (ll. 541-8)

In the battle of 25 July, after fierce fighting, the Dutch van and centre began to retire to the coast of Holland with the English following. The Dutch rear had been engaging Sir Jeremy Smith's squadron, and this subsidiary battle had broken from the main action. On the evening of 26 July the main Dutch fleet anchored off Flushing, covered from English attack by shoals. On the following morning the Dutch rear squadron, which Smith had lost through his anxiety in a shallow sea, also reached safety.² Dryden inverts the sequence of events and places the Dutch retreat before the engagement of 25 July. This enables him to emphasize the cunning of 'the wary *Dutch*', who withdraw to their treacherous shallows 'and there lay snares to catch the *British Hoast*' (ll. 713-28), and the aggressive courage of the English:

But, with a fore-wind pushing them above,
And swelling tyde that heav'd them from below,
O'r the blind flats our warlike Squadrons move,
And, with spread sails, to welcome Battel go. (ll. 729-32)

¹ *Diary*, 7 and 9 June 1666.

² Tedder, op. cit., p. 175.

To the pale foes they suddenly draw near,
 And summon them to unexpected fight:
 They start like Murderers when Ghosts appear,
 And draw their Curtains in the dead of night. (ll. 737-40)

Dryden then represents the main action at sea as the climax of the engagement (lines 741-64) and ends derisively:

Their batter'd Admiral too soon withdrew,
 Unthank'd by ours for his unfinish'd fight:
 But he the minds of his *Dutch* Masters knew,
 Who call'd that providence which we call'd flight. (ll. 765-8)

Who ere would *English* Monuments survey
 In other records may our courage know:
 But let them hide the story of this day,
 Whose fame was blemish'd by too base a foe. (ll. 781-4)

In fact, the battle ended in anti-climax: the English fleet lost its chance of crushing the enemy. The conduct of Sir Jeremy Smith was criticized. He blamed his pilot; and, says Pepys, 'the thing is not accommodated, but only taken up, and both sides commanded to be quiet'. Coventry spoke 'very slightly of the late victory', and Pepys himself regarded it as 'enough to give us the name of conquerors, and leave us masters of the sea, but without any such great matters done as should give the Duke of Albemarle any honour at all'. The casualties of the Dutch

hath raised the estimation of the late victory considerably; but it is only among fools: for all that was but accidental. But this morning, getting Sir W. Pen to read over the Narrative with me, he did sparingly, yet plainly, say that we might have intercepted their Zealand squadron coming home, if we had done our parts; and more, that we might have spooned before the wind as well as they, and have overtaken their ships in the pursuite, in all the while.¹

¹ *Diary*, 24 October, 30 and 31 July, 3 August 1666.

YEATS'S SUPERNATURAL SONGS

By PETER URE

Aimer, c'est la vie de l'ange! — BALZAC, *Louis Lambert*

EIGHT of these poems were first published in *The King of the Great Clock Tower, Commentaries and Poems*, a Cuala Press volume of 1934; the entire group of twelve appeared the following year in *A Full Moon in March*. When he read one of them to Frank O'Connor, Yeats told F. R. Higgins, 'O'Connor was rude and said he didn't understand a word of it.'¹ Some perplexities may perhaps be resolved if the first four poems, to which I am going to confine the discussion in this paper, are read as the expression of a single movement of poetical thought. Since the poems are by Yeats, this thought is of the kind which, in Richard Ellmann's phrases, focuses contradictory attitudes and 'presents reality as if by antithesis'.²

Thus the four poems contrast with one another in verse-movement and pattern; they are poems of different shapes, longish and meditative, and little and mechanical. In tone, they vary between vehemence and calm assurance. The first and the third recount experiences of a magical or mystical character—perhaps we may call them *supernatural*, as Yeats did, and so describe both kinds. The second and the fourth present fragments of theology. But the second pair does not seem to illustrate or support the first pair; or, if it does so, the comment is oblique and even contradictory. Then again, the experience recounted in the first poem, 'Ribh at the Tomb of Baile and Aillinn', is very different from that of the third, 'Ribh in Ecstasy': the vision in the first poem is a reward bestowed upon an initiate, the fruit of his purity and fabulous old age, and leaves Ribh in solemn, supernatural light; the ecstasy in the third poem comes and vanishes suddenly—unasked and unexpected, it seems—and leaves Ribh desolate in the common light of day. The second poem, 'Ribh Denounces Patrick' (originally entitled 'Ribh Prefers an Older Theology'), is concerned with the birth and generation of the gods, while the fourth poem, 'There', is about the heavenly condition, the end of time. This effect, as of elements straining in different ways, yet all obviously having something in common,

¹ F. O'Connor, 'What Made Yeats a Great Poet?', *Listener*, 15 May 1947, p. 762. O'Connor reports Yeats as saying that the poem read was 'Meru', the last in the published series but the first composed. Yeats used, however, to refer to the whole series by this title. It is not clear why Ellmann (*The Identity of Yeats* (London, 1954), p. 282) states that the poem read on this occasion was 'Ribh Denounces Patrick', unless he has been misled by O'Connor's claim that the first lines of the next poem ('Ribh in Ecstasy') refer to this incident. This claim seems to me very doubtful. The point is of some importance, since it affects the interpretation of 'Ribh in Ecstasy'.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 244.

is a system of stresses contrived by an architect who was expert at building structures such as this.

I

What the poems most obviously have in common is their speaker or singer, Ribh. He can express and suffer these different things because he is himself a creature who embodies in his own person a Yeatsian distinction between kinds of men. Yeats tells us that he is an 'old hermit',¹ 'an imaginary critic of St. Patrick'.² As such, it is fairly obvious that he revives the long-abandoned role of Oisín, who argues with the apostle of Ireland in the *Agallamh na Sanorach* and in Yeats's earliest narrative *The Wanderings of Oisín*. The name Ribh, Yeats says also, has been conferred upon his own thoughts. This is plain enough, too: Ribh is a stylized poetic self, the Blakean and Byzantine 'aged man' who recurs in *Purgatory* and elsewhere. Yeats has made him venerable and holy by adding twenty years to his own age. The hermit's Christianity 'comes perhaps from Egypt'.³ Yeats is no doubt thinking of the anchorites who joined St. Antony by the Mareotic Lake and there

Starved upon the shore
And withered to a bag of bones!⁴

The figure, then, if we generalize about it from what Yeats tells us in his comments in *The King of the Great Clock Tower* and *A Full Moon in March*, is an imaginary hermit and theologian conflated with an aged Yeats, who is not austere but irritable and 'coarse', like the 'wild old wicked man' in the poem of that title. So the monk's devotion and the old man's sexuality may coexist in Ribh as in him:

'Because I am mad about women
I am mad about the hills,'
Said the wild old wicked man.⁵

But in the two poems 'Ribh at the Tomb . . .' and 'Ribh in Ecstasy' the experiences recorded are very different from each other. They help to separate the two elements in the personality; they suggest perhaps that this personality is not meant to be seen as a harmonious concord, or, at the least, that we cannot see it fully unless we trace its inward articulations.

In the first poem, as Yeats wrote to Olivia Shakespear,

a monk reads his breviary at midnight upon the tomb of long-dead lovers on the anniversary of their death, for on that night they are united above the tomb, their

¹ *The King of the Great Clock Tower* (Dublin, 1934), p. 45.

² *A Full Moon in March* (London, 1935), p. vi.

³ Ibid.

⁴ 'Demon and Beast', *Collected Poems* (London, 1950), p. 210.

⁵ Ibid., p. 356. My italics.

embrace being not partial but a conflagration of the entire body and so shedding the light he reads by.¹

Ribh is able to behold this vision of the unearthly intercourse of the dead lovers because his eyes are

By water, herb and solitary prayer
Made aquiline²

—like an eagle's, like the old man's of the later poem 'An Acre of Grass', who prays to attain this eagle mind so that he may perceive the truth. But unlike the old man of that poem, Ribh has no need to pray for enlightenment through frenzy; the air is calm and the vision achieved. After his austerity has brought this reward, Ribh is able not only to look upon it but to expound it to us in a decisively catechistical manner, as T. R. Henn has remarked.³ He is the teacher addressing his disciples: 'Mark and digest my tale, carry it afar. . . . Speak what none have heard.' In 'Ribh in Ecstasy' all this is quite gone:

What matter that you understood no word!
Doubtless I spoke or sang what I had heard
In broken sentences.

The ecstasy itself—leaving undiscussed for the moment what kind of ecstasy it is—is spasmodic and incoherent, something given rather than achieved; it does not, apparently, crown a lifetime's disciplined effort, but with sudden violence takes Ribh 'out of himself' and then returns him to the common day. In both poems, therefore, things are seen or heard which lie beyond nature, but they are experienced in very different ways. These ways correspond to a distinction that Yeats had drawn many years before in *Per Amica Silentia Lunae* (1917):

I think that we who are poets and artists, not being permitted to shoot beyond the tangible, must go from desire to weariness and so to desire again, and live but for the moment when vision comes to our weariness like terrible lightning, in the humility of the brutes. . . . We seek reality with the slow toil of our weakness and are smitten from the boundless and the unforeseen. Only when we are saint or sage, and renounce Experience itself, can we, in the imagery of the Christian Caballa, leave the sudden lightning and the path of the serpent and become the bowman who aims his arrow at the centre of the sun.⁴

The Sage who renounces Experience and travels straight towards Vision, and the Artist who is smitten from the boundless and unforeseen, as by the lightning flash, are the two modes of Ribh's existence as it is expressed

¹ *Letters of W. B. Yeats*, ed. Wade (London, 1954), p. 824.

² The text of all quotations from 'Supernatural Songs' is that of *A Full Moon in March*.

³ *The Lonely Tower* (London, 1950), p. 294.

⁴ *Essays* (London, 1924), pp. 503-4.

in the first and the third poems respectively. That they are present together, and strive against one another in the same *dramatis persona*, reminds us of Yeats's psychological system, which he had worked out very elaborately in *A Vision*: by this, each man has a self and an anti-self, a hidden opposite which he pursues. Another way of saying this was to describe the selves as primary, or objective, and antithetical, or subjective. Yeats wrote in a diary:

The antithetical man works by flashes of lightning. He was the burden of himself and must lose himself to rest—Primary man does not lose himself, he may be perfect, a saint or a sage. . . . The antithetical man is always impure and lonely—though pure in the lightning flash.¹

So the primary Ribh, the Sage of the first poem, is pure and has a vision of heaven which is external to himself, achieved through training and discipline; during it he maintains his self-possession. In the third poem, Ribh is caught up into something in which the coherent speech of the self is lost. If we look at them in this way, in the context of Yeats's earlier thoughts, the first and the third poems appear to complement and complete each other in a meaningful way.

II

So far I have been discussing the poems in order to show how the study of Ribh's personality may help us to understand their system of antitheses. The poet, however, was concerned not only with character—the emotions of a soul—but with ideas as well—the emotions of a soul dwelling in the presence of certain ideas'.² There are thoughts, he wrote in *The Trembling of the Veil*, which 'sustain us in defeat or give us victory'; tested by passion, they become our convictions.³ To these he referred when he told Dorothy Wellesley: 'I have put [into *Purgatory*] my own conviction about this world and the next.'⁴ We are bound to ask who Ribh is, and equally bound to inquire about the convictions which Yeats put into him. What is the character of his supernatural experiences? What does his theology teach or imply? We turn, therefore, to look at the poems in sequence in order to discover their materials and their relationship to each other. Here again reality is presented by means of diverse and antithetical elements.

Why did Yeats choose for Ribh's first visionary experience this fable and

¹ Quoted by A. N. Jeffares, *W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet* (London, 1949), p. 335.

² Quoted by Ellmann, *op. cit.*, p. 43, from an uncollected article in *Bookman*, August 1894.

³ *Autobiographies* (London, 1926), p. 234.

⁴ *Letters*, p. 913.

this manner of description as they are found in the central portion of 'Ribh at the Tomb . . .'?

Of Baile and Aillinn you need not speak,
All know their tale, all know what leaf and twig,
What juncture of the apple and the yew,
Surmount their bones; but speak what none have heard.

The miracle that gave them such a death
Transfigured to pure substance what had once
Been bone and sinew; when such bodies join
There is no touching here, nor touching there,
Nor straining joy, but whole is joined to whole;
For the intercourse of angels is a light
Where for its moment both seem lost, consumed.

Here in the pitch-dark atmosphere above
The trembling of the apple and the yew,
Here on the anniversary of their death,
The anniversary of their first embrace,
These lovers, purified by tragedy,
Hurry into each other's arms. . . .

One reason is that they had long been present in his mind. The germ of the poem, mentioned in letters to Mrs. Shakespear in 1933, is 'that saying of Swedenborg's that the sexual intercourse of angels is a conflagration of the whole being'.¹ Yeats first read Swedenborg when he was a very young man and re-read him in 1913; about this time he wrote the essay on 'Swedenborg, Mediums and the Desolate Places', which was published in Lady Gregory's *Visions and Beliefs in the West of Ireland* (1920). Swedenborgian ideas have some influence on *A Vision*. What A. N. Jeffares² calls his obsession with Swedenborg's description of the intercourse of angels is present in the essay on 'The Irish Dramatic Movement' (1919)³ and in *Per Amica Silentia Lunae*, the prolegomenon to *A Vision*:

I do not doubt that [the dead at a certain stage of their discarnate existence] make love in that union which Swedenborg has said is of the whole body and seems from far off an incandescence.⁴

The lovers in the poem are in the 'condition of fire', the 'God's holy fire'

¹ Ibid., p. 824.

² Op. cit., p. 283.

³ *Plays and Controversies* (London, 1923), p. 201. Another passage in the same essay throws light on Yeats's use of the word *straining* in the poem: 'great dramatic persons . . . those men and women of Plutarch, who made their death a ritual of passion; for what is passion but the straining of man's being against some obstacle that obstructs its unity' (p. 209). Baile and Aillinn, being without earthly passion, love unobstructedly. I do not think that Henn's reference of the word to the Leda poem (op. cit., p. 296) will work out.

⁴ *Essays* (1924), p. 523.

of 'Sailing to Byzantium',¹ which Yeats described as a heavenly state where is 'all music and all rest':

When all sequence comes to an end, time comes to an end, and the soul puts on the rhythmic or spiritual body or luminous body and contemplates all the events of its memory in an eternal possession of itself in one single moment.²

There can be little doubt that the notion of the luminous, purified and incandescent condition of the souls of the dead, which is also found in Henry More and other neo-Platonic writings that Yeats knew, acquired fresh life in the 1930's through Yeats's reading of Berkeley's *Siris*,³ and his re-reading of Balzac's Swedenborgian stories *Séraphita* and *Louis Lambert*. On the latter Yeats wrote an essay in 1934, which guides us back to the poet's young manhood and to a visionary experience of his own which proved of lasting imaginative importance to him:

Passages in *Séraphita* suggest [Balzac's] familiarity with a state known to me in youth, a state transcending sleep when forms, often of great beauty, appear minutely articulated in brilliant light, forms that express by word or action some spiritual idea and are so moulded or tinted that they make all human flesh seem unhealthy.⁴

When Yeats was twenty-two, a guest of Edward Martyn at Tulira Castle, he had a vision, later recorded in *The Trembling of the Veil* (1922), of 'a naked woman of incredible beauty, standing upon a pedestal and shooting an arrow at a star. I still remember the tint of that marvellous flesh which makes all human flesh seem unhealthy.'⁵ In *Per Amica Silentia Lunae*, as

¹ On the condition of fire, see C. Brooks in *The Permanence of Yeats* (New York, 1950), p. 85.

² *Essays* (1924), p. 524.

³ Section 171, *Works of G. Berkeley*, ed. Luce and Jessop (London, 1953), v. 89: 'Galen likewise taught that, admitting the soul to be incorporeal, it hath for its immediate tegument or vehicle a body of aether or fire, by the intervention whereof it moveth other bodies, and is mutually affected by them. This interior clothing was supposed to remain upon the soul not only after death, but after the most thorough purgation.' Imagery of light is of course endemic in Swedenborg: his angels are regularly seen 'in their own light' and can be observed only by the purified spiritual sight (e.g. *Heaven and Hell* (London, 1899), p. 41; the heavens and hells in the *Arcana Celestia* are managed in terms of light and dark symbolism). A passage in Yeats's essay on *Prometheus Unbound* gathers together one or two other links: 'There is much curious evidence to show that the Divine Purpose . . . descends into the mind at moments of inspiration, not as spiritual life alone but as what seems a physical brightness. Perhaps everybody that pursues that life for however short a time, even, as it were, but to chase it, experiences now and again during sleep bright coherent dreams where something is shown or spoken that grows in meaning with the passage of time. Blake spoke of this "stronger and better light", called its source "the human form divine", Shelley's "harmonious soul of many a soul", or, as we might say, the Divine Purpose. The stationary, joyous energy of certain among his figures . . . suggests radiating light. We understand why the first Christian painters encircled certain heads with light' (*Essays 1931-36* (Dublin, 1937), pp. 59-60).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵ *Autobiographies*, p. 458.

we have seen, this shooting at the star becomes a symbol for the straight path which the saint or sage takes towards the supernatural reality. Thus the chosen figure in 'Ribh at the Tomb . . .' of angelic, luciferent intercourse has correspondences over the whole period of Yeats's creative life.

To this image Yeats attached the legend of Baile and Aillinn. This again draws commentary back towards past work. The short narrative poem *Baile and Aillinn* (1903) is one of several poems on the theme of dead lovers who achieve the consummation of their love after death. Baile of the Honey Mouth and Aillinn, daughter of the King of Leinster's son, died of grief when each heard that the other was dead; it was Yeats's imagination, rather than the Irish original,¹ which interpreted this act of Aengus, the Master of Love, as a means whereby the lovers might achieve an everlasting bliss of communion in his own land of the dead:

Their love was never drowned in care
Of this or that thing, nor grew cold
Because their bodies had grown old.
Being forbid to marry on earth,
They blossomed to immortal mirth.

The fullest treatment of the theme that it is better to renounce earthly love, whose perfection is certain to be flawed by trouble and disillusion, and dedicate all to a consummation beyond time, is found in *The Shadowy Waters*, a play on which Yeats worked for twenty years (1885-1905). Forgael, the hero, voyaging through waste seas, seeks a love

of a beautiful, unheard of kind
That is not of this world.

AIBRIC

And yet the world
Has beautiful women to please every man.

FORGAEL

But he that gets their love after the fashion
Loves in brief longing and deceiving hope
And bodily tenderness, and finds that even
The bed of love, that in the imagination
Had seemed to be the giver of all peace,
Is no more than a wine-cup in the tasting,
And as soon finished.

AIBRIC

All that ever loved
Have loved that way—there is no other way.

¹ A version of the story is given in Lady Gregory's *Cuchulain of Muirthemne* (London, 1903), pp. 305-6; see also D. M. Hoare, *The Work of Morris and Yeats in relation to Early Saga Literature* (Cambridge, 1937), p. 117.

FORGAEL

Yet never have two lovers kissed but they
Believed there was some other near at hand,
And almost wept because they could not find it.¹

The aspiring hero at last encounters, in Dectora, a woman who is ready to sail away with him from the ordinary world to 'grow immortal' in his company. The source of this theme is to be found in no more recondite a place than the earliest and most notorious of Yeats's many sacred books, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam's *Axël*, which the youthful poet painfully spelled out with the aid of a dictionary and remembered all his life. In the fastnesses of his castle at Auërspurg Axël persuaded Sara to die with arguments very like those used by Forgael to justify his disdain of ordinary loves.² Nor must we forget the contribution made towards the permanent establishment of this theme in Yeats's art by his admiration for the Japanese Noh play *Nishikigi*. Ezra Pound published his translation of this in 1916, but Yeats had read the work in progress. It tells the moving story of how two lovers, parted in life owing to the girl's unconscious cruelty, are united in death through the piety of an old priest. The cave which they inhabit blazes with light as a sign of their union:

Strange, what seemed so very old a cave
Is all glittering-bright within,
Like the flicker of fire.³

If we bear these analogues in mind, the nature of the thought or 'conviction' in 'Ribh at the Tomb . . .' becomes clearer. We learn something of the mystery—what it is that Ribh wishes his disciples to 'mark and digest and carry afar', the secret part of the story that no one else has heard. All the tales which correlate with the Baile and Aillinn legend are tales of lovers who were disunited and distressed on earth, or who longed for something greater and less perishable than mortal love. To achieve this, they pass beyond the natural world. Their bodies are consumed away, gathered into the 'artifice of eternity', into the condition of fire. I quote the phrase from 'Sailing to Byzantium' as a reminder that this is not just a ninetyish notion which Yeats outgrew when he outgrew *Axël*, and to avoid the danger of underestimating the continuity in Yeats's convictions, which used to mislead his commentators. The Swedenborgian and neo-Platonic imagery of light comes in to reinforce the theme of the difference between the mortal and the immortal lovers: their bodies are composed of a super-

¹ *Collected Works* (Stratford-on-Avon, 1908), ii. 195-6.

² See, for example, Axël's speech, de l'Isle-Adam, *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1923), iv. 262-3.

³ *The Translations of Ezra Pound* (London, 1953), p. 293.

natural substance, of purer fire, and their delights are such as men cannot know. This is insisted upon in the poem:

when such bodies join
There is no touching here, nor touching there,
Nor straining joy, but whole is joined to whole.

Like *Axël* and Sara, they enjoy a '*miraculeuse nuit nuptiale*'.¹ The whole image, and all its antecedents, emphasize a division between the natural and the supernatural world. The scheme of the poem, Ribh's relation to his vision, supports this emphasis. The sage looks upon, but is not caught up into, the transcendence. The modes of existence of the two worlds are quite different: on the one hand, the unearthly lovers blazing in their joy; on the other, the austere, dispassionate, and fantastically aged solitary, whose relation to the mystery is no closer than that of an expositor, teaching it to others as a secret thing.

This needs emphasizing, because it is precisely this conception of a barrier between natural and supernatural and of a difference in kind between the two sorts of life that is to meet its antithesis in the next poems. It was Yeats's skill in creating such antitheses that helped to turn him from a poet absorbed chiefly in *Axël*-like fantasy into a poet of the kind that he became in his later and greater work. 'Ribh at the Tomb . . .', despite its charm and power, will leave us back where *Axël* found Yeats in the eighties unless we read it in conjunction with what follows.

III

For what follows is a restless and almost violent refusal to admit that the burden of the body must be thrown off before the soul can be satisfied. The tone alters, and a simple, rocking, exultant rhythm takes the place of the meditative paragraphs of the first poem; in 'Ribh Denounces Patrick' theology displaces contemplation and the discursive intellect the purified heart. Nature and supernature are not separated and need not communicate only by means of the contemplative vision of the sage. Ribh rejects the 'masculine Trinity' of Christianity because it implies, like the contrast of austerity and conflagration in the first poem, an absolute difference between the two kinds of life:

An abstract Greek absurdity has crazed the man—
Recall that masculine Trinity. Man, woman, child (a daughter or a son),
That's how all natural or supernatural stories run.

Natural and supernatural with the self-same ring are wed.
As man, as beast, as an ephemeral fly begets, Godhead begets Godhead,
For things below are copies, the Great Smaragdine Tablet said.

¹ *Axël*, ed. cit., p. 263.

The rejection of a masculine Trinity may well derive from Yeats's early theosophical studies. 'The Trinity of the Egyptians and that of the mythological Greeks', wrote Mme Blavatsky, once his mentor in these matters, in *Isis Unveiled*, 'were alike representations of the first triple emanation containing two male principles and one female.' We remember that Ribh's 'Christianity . . . comes perhaps from Egypt'. 'When I close my eyes', Yeats had written in 1919, 'and pronounce the word "Christianity" and await its unconscious suggestion, I do not see Christ crucified, or the Good Shepherd from the catacombs, but a father and mother and their children, a picture by Leonardo da Vinci most often.'

But this correspondence between natural and supernatural in the family, holy and profane, and in the sexual act, is no sooner established than the theologian discovers the difference between the two which distinguishes, and limits, the human progenitor. 'The point of the poem', Yeats wrote, 'is that we beget and bear because of the incompleteness of our love',² and this is developed in the two next and concluding stanzas:

Yet all must copy copies, all increase their kind;
When the conflagration of their passion sinks, damped by the body or the mind,
That juggling nature mounts, her coil in their embraces twined.

The mirror-scalèd serpent is multiplicity,
But all that run in couples, on earth, in flood or air, share God that is but three,
And could beget or bear themselves could they but love as He.

Here God becomes like the Presences in 'Among School Children', the undying images which are hailed as 'self-born mockers of man's enterprise'. This enterprise is man's struggle to make exact the correspondence between his way of loving and God's. The theology of the first two stanzas of the poem suggests that success in this enterprise ought to be possible. But it is frustrated by man's possession of body and mind; thereby 'that juggling nature' intrudes with its coils. This symbol for nature as the Serpent and its winding Path is used elsewhere by Yeats: it is the same path which the Artist must tread, caught in 'the winding movement of nature'. This serpent of nature, which has scales like mirrors because it endlessly repeats images, is what makes men endlessly beget and bear, or symbolizes that process. Natural generation, we have been told in the first two stanzas, is a copy of supernatural; we might therefore expect man in the sexual act to be like God, complete and changeless, an eternal Trinity whose number

¹ *If I were Four and Twenty* (Dublin, 1940), p. 12. This essay first appeared in 1919. The version of 'Ribh Denounces Patrick' in *The King of the Great Clock Tower* has slightly different opening lines. In both versions *recall* means 'revoke'. The Great Smaragdine Tablet of line 6 is the *Tabula Smaragdina* attributed to 'Hermes Trismegistus': cf. with the reference to it here the one in 'Symbolism in Painting', *Collected Works*, vi. 176.

² *Letters*, p. 824.

never alters; instead, he falls into 'multiplicity'. This was often a bad word to Yeats: by a misreading in a famous letter of 1827 he makes Blake say that 'amongst the delusions of the goddess Nature' were the 'laws of the numbers' and glosses this phrase as 'the multiplicity of nature';¹ elsewhere Yeats speaks of his fear lest the 'multiplicity of interest and opinion' destroy his absorption in the passionate moment.²

'Ribh Denounces Patrick', therefore, begins as a trenchant expression of Ribh's antithetical self, the self that will not yield, even in placid vision, to being separated from the supernatural life, but proclaims its likeness to that life. In the first poem, Ribh had seemed complete, the perfected Sage; but it was only one of the selves that was complete. As with civilizations, so with men—the more finished and elaborate the primary self, the greater the 'counter-longing' of the antithetical self.³ This second self resists the perfection of the first, and its theology countervails the fable of Baile and Aillinn. But it, too, is forced to recognize that man and God cannot 'live each other's life', and the Ribh of the second poem falls back also before the barrier—not, like the Ribh of the first poem, in calm acceptance, but in restless dismay.

The two poems have in this way brought us to a crisis in this drama of the self and anti-self. The first, the 'primary' self, the Sage, has achieved its perfection in solemn vision; the second, the antithetical, the Artist, struggling against the other, awaits its own moment of completion. This is what Yeats called 'the two halves of the soul separate and face to face'. But the counter-longing of the second half of the soul, which its theology has given expression to, can only become 'a conscious energy', and so complete itself, 'suddenly, in those moments of revelation which are as a flash of lightning'. We are already familiar with this metaphor as a way of describing the Artist's perception of reality, which smites him 'from the boundless and the unforeseen', 'vision . . . like terrible lightning'.⁴

'Ribh in Ecstasy' records such a vision, resolves the dramatic crisis in the sequence, and completes the second self.

What matter that you understood no word!
Doubtless I spoke or sang what I had heard
In broken sentences. My soul had found
All happiness in its own cause or ground.
Godhead on Godhead in sexual spasm began

¹ *Collected Works*, vi. 167, essay on 'William Blake and his Illustrations'; the misreading is preserved in the later reprint in *Essays* (1924), p. 170. What Blake actually wrote was 'Law of the Members' (*Poetry and Prose of W. Blake*, ed. G. Keynes (London, 1939), p. 927).

² *Autobiographies*, p. 334.

³ See *Plays and Controversies*, pp. 217–18.

⁴ The phrases quoted in this paragraph will be found in *Essays* (1924), p. 503, and *Plays and Controversies*, pp. 217–18.

Godhead. Some shadow fell. My soul forgot
Those amorous cries that out of quiet come
And must the common round of day resume.

It is obvious how completely this is antithetical to the separation of natural and supernatural accepted by Ribh in the first poem. The lines are a way of saying 'In my ecstasy I, Ribh, became like God', that is to say like the trine God of the theology of the second poem, who begot and bore himself. The experience is so intense that it is compared to the sexual ecstasy of this God:

My soul had found
All happiness in its own cause or ground.
[It was as though] Godhead on Godhead in sexual spasm begot
Godhead.

This does not mean that Ribh's ecstasy is itself of a sexual character. It is, rather, a realization of the self in the sense found in the *Upanishads* and the *Aphorisms* of Patanjali, which Yeats was studying at this time; they too make use of sexual metaphor to signalize the intensity.¹ Ribh's ecstasy must be distinguished also from the Christian mystical use of sexual imagery, which is used to describe the mystic's union with God; in the poem, the mystic has momentarily become a God—a terrible heresy from the Christian point of view. The experience happens, as we have seen, to Ribh as Artist, or poetic self, not to Ribh as Sage, or austere anchorite. It is tempting, therefore, to identify the ecstasy as artistic ecstasy, the sense of self-completion achieved, for example, in the writing of a poem. There is plenty of material in Yeats's writing that would support such an interpretation. I give two examples both recently made available from unpublished writings:

The end of art is ecstasy. . . . It is a sudden sense of power and peace that comes when we have before our mind's eye a group of images which obeys us, which leaves us free, and which satisfies the needs of our soul. (1915)

. . . we may escape from the constraint of our nature and from that of external things, entering upon a state where all fuel has become flame. . . . We attain it always in the creation or enjoyment of a work of art, but that moment . . . passes from us. (1928)²

I am not sure how far we need accept this identification of the God-like ecstasy with the moment of aesthetic joy. If we do accept it, it shows how enduringly Yeats maintained, like that very different figure Thomas Hardy,

¹ For example: 'As a man in the embrace of his beloved wife forgets everything that is without, everything that is within; so man in the embrace of the knowing Self, forgets everything that is without, everything that is within; for there all desires are satisfied, Self his sole desire; man goes beyond sorrow' (*The Ten Principal Upanishads*, trans. Shri Purohit Swami and W. B. Yeats (London, 1937), p. 151).

² Ellmann, op. cit., pp. 105, 221.

a kind of religion of aesthetics, or substitution of art for religion, which is no longer at all fashionable. Yet we must remember that the ecstasy, even if it is of that character, pertains only to one of the selves: the complete reality is the total picture of the struggle of the selves—their system of antitheses—which is revealed by all three poems read together.

This system of antitheses is completed by the fourth poem, 'There'. The first three poems have each contained descriptions of the heavenly state: the dead lovers, the life of God, and momentary participation in that life. These have been presented as expressions of the double personality of Ribh. The last antithesis is a ferocious Yeatsian irony, in which the sexual imagery, which has linked the poems, and the personality of Ribh, even his voice perhaps, suddenly cease. In *this* description of heaven, we are presented instead with four highly traditional symbols:

There all the barrel-hoops are knit,
There all the serpent-tails are bit,
There all the gyres converge in one,
There all the planets drop in the Sun.

There is the *ἐκεῖ* of Plotinus, the Divine Sphere, the Intelligible World, 'not to be spoken of, not to be written'.¹ Yeats called it the Thirteenth Cone or Sphere; it is the one that transcends the gyres.² The poem brashly proclaims itself as a symbolical way of speaking. Like the privative terminology used by the mystics, it tells us what heaven transcends, but not what it is. It refuses direct description, and no longer attempts to describe the supernatural by means of sexual imagery and the struggle of the selves. All that power and force, which has been Ribh's method, is ironically diminished, and for its bread we are given the stone of these little mechanical figures. The three other poems all say that man cannot wholly share the life of heaven: even for the ecstatic his human condition reasserts itself; he 'must the common round of day resume'. This last poem says that he cannot describe it either. It sets Ribh's struggle in a rather grim perspective. Instead of its richness of conflict and its metaphors of sex and light we have this poverty and infertility, as though a diagram had been substituted for a painting and the free imagination bundled into the schoolroom cupboard. We are assigned, as it were, a little handful of cardboard simulacra for the reality which lies beyond the reach of description: since all are mere diagrams, mere attempts by the human intellect to translate into its language what it cannot understand, it scarcely matters which we choose.

It is not wrong, I think, to find the series disappointing when we see it as a whole. The poems are admirable for the intellectual nimbleness

¹ *Enneads*, trs. S. MacKenna (London, 1926), i. 125. Yeats bought and read this translation on publication.

² *A Vision* (London, 1937), p. 210.

displayed in their arrangement; admirable, too, for the way Yeats steers past the danger of too confident affirmation about mystery by instantly directing our minds to the counter-affirmation. But the doctrine of the self and the anti-self, when put into poetry, is too like the spectacle of a ventriloquist playing with a pair of dolls. To give each a voice, Yeats has divided his human voice between them, and to give each passion he has robbed himself of his own. There is left to him only the terrible intellectual energy with which the game is contrived and the movements of the puppets controlled. When we might hope for Yeats to speak with his own voice and to explore the mystery with his own passion, in the last poem, nothing emerges except a handful of cardboard objects: after the dummies, the toys. A good deal of Yeats's later poetry seems to suffer from this kind of limitation, which may become increasingly apparent as the years pass.

We the great gazebo built,
They convicted us of guilt.

For a house to live in, readers may turn from his ornamental structures, elaborately pretty but slightly sinister in their obsolescence, and go back to other poets, to Wordsworth, for example, to the undivided voice and the 'essential passions of the human heart'.

NOTES

THE WORD *FEUD*

It is a curious fact of Modern English philology that the word *feud*, though it has become very familiar and is simple-looking in form, nevertheless is of comparatively late appearance and of unsolved etymology. *O.E.D.* treats it as an altered form of the northern word *fede*, which dates from ME. (the first citation is from *Cursor Mundi*) and is derived from Old French, but is unable to explain how the form came to be altered. The modern word first appears in the sixteenth century, spelt *fewd* in Lambarde's *Αρχαιονομία* (1568); later there occur the easily explicable variant spellings *feude* and *feaud* (both dated 1601), *feud* (1613), and *fewde* (1631) (see *O.E.D.*, s.v. *feud* sb.¹), but beside these there are also *foode* (Painter, 1566, and later sixteenth-century writers), *feood* (Spenser, *F.Q.*, iv. i. 26; but he also has *food*, *F.Q.*, i. viii. 9, ii. i. 3), *feode* (Hall, 1614), *fude* (Florio, 1598), and *fuid(e)* (Stanyhurst, 1583, and Preface to the 1611 Bible), the explanation of which is by no means obvious. From about 1620 onwards *feud* is well established as the standard form.

Bradley's discussion of the word in *O.E.D.*, though inconclusive, does establish two facts of value: (a) that the change of form from *fede* to *feud* cannot be explained from the influence of *feud* sb.² 'a fee' < med. L. *feudum*; (b) that the sixteenth-century English word was recognized by contemporaries as being of northern origin. Bradley further suggests that there may have been an OE. **fēod* which, as he says, would normally have become ME. **fede* but which he supposes may in some northern dialect have been pronounced with a rising diphthong which would develop to the sixteenth-century forms. But this suggestion does not really help, for two reasons. (a) A rising OE. diphthong *eō* would become ME. *ē*. This would account for the *food* form and also, in view of the northern change of ME. *ē* > [y:], for the *fude*, *fuide* forms; but it would not explain the *feood* and *feode* forms, nor the most important of all, *feud*, unless this were regarded as merely a spelling-variant of *fude*. But it is in fact not a mere spelling-variant; it is proved to have had ME. *eu*, not ME. [y:], by the spelling *feaud* (*eau* is a spelling of ME. *eu*, not of ME. *iu* and ME. [y:]) and by the evidence of the orthoepists Hodges (*The English Primrose*, 1643) and Price (*English Orthographie*, 1668), both of whom give ME. *eu* in *feud* (Hodges four times). (b) To set up a hypothetical form, unrecorded both in OE. and in ME., to account for a sixteenth-century word is always a dubious proceeding, though sometimes necessary; and to add

the hypothesis of a stress-shift of an unexampled type emphasizes the improbability.¹

Bradley's hypothesis in *O.E.D.* should therefore be rejected; but in one way it points the right line of inquiry, for implicitly it dissociates the sixteenth-century word (*O.E.D.*'s β -forms *feud*, *foode*, &c.) from the earlier *fede* and seeks a distinct explanation for the former. Indeed it is doubtful whether the treatment of the sixteenth-century word in the same article as the ME. one is justified. But clearly the earlier word cannot simply be left out of account altogether; meaning and the northern localization show that somehow the sixteenth-century word has connexions with it.

A more likely hypothesis, which has independently occurred to me, had earlier been advanced by Bradley himself in a note in *The Academy*, xlv (17 March 1894), 229; he described the suggestion as 'somewhat adventurous', did not elaborate it in detail, and clearly had abandoned it by the time the article in *O.E.D.* was ready for publication (September 1895), but nevertheless he seems to me to have been right. After setting out the forms of *feud* (as above) he argued, as in *O.E.D.*; that they could not be explained from *feud* < *feudum* and put forward for discussion the view that they might 'represent a northern English (not Scottish) **faehood* (or *-hude*) = *foe-hood*'; and he commented that 'it is noteworthy that some writers of the seventeenth century actually have the phrase "deadly fohood" synonymous with "deadly feud"'. The demonstration of this view, which he did not attempt, depends on certain facts of sixteenth-century pronunciation and in particular on the differences in pronunciation that obtained between south and north, and may proceed by the following stages.

(1) The ME. *fede*, being from OF. *fede*, *feide*, *faide*, had two forms in English: (a) a form with ME. \bar{e} , which by this date in the north would be pronounced either [fi:d] (cf. the spelling *feed* cited by Craigie, *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* s.v. *fede* from Montgomerie (1605) and later authors) or [fe:d]; (b) a form with ME. *ei* > *ai*, which by this date in the north would be pronounced [fe:d] and so be identical with the second of the two pronunciations which would represent the ME. \bar{e} form. Such a pronunciation [fe:d] is shown by the spellings *faid* and *fade* cited by Craigie from Scott (*a.* 1568) and Dalrymple (1596) respectively. (2) By this date in the north the ME. (northern) *fā* 'foe' would have come to be pronounced [fe:] and is spelt, *inter alia*, *fai*. (3) It would therefore be possible, by popular etymology, to take [fe:d] 'hostility' as being [fe:] 'foe' plus a contracted suffix represented by [d], i.e. as a contraction of **faihead* (see *O.E.D.* on the persistence of the *-head* form of the suffix in Scottish); in consequence there might be developed, with substitution of the *-hood*

¹ Bradley cites *four* < OE. *feower* as a parallel; but the stress-shift in this word is associated with the following *to* rather than the preceding *f*.

form of the suffix, a hyper-correct northern English form, **faihood* pronounced [fe:(h)u:d] and [fe:(h)ud].¹ (4) The southern adoptions are of this artificially modified form. (a) In one development the word was correctly analysed, in its modified shape, as equivalent to English *foehood*, a word which appears at exactly the right date, being used by Laneham (1575) and later writers (see *O.E.D.*, s.v.). (b) There is evidence in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that ME. *ō* in final position, especially in northern dialects, was often pronounced [u:]; in particular the northerners Levins (1570) and Poole (1657) in their rhyming dictionaries show *foe* with the pronunciation [fu:]. Hence *foehood* could be pronounced [fu:(h)u(:)d], which by contraction would easily become [fu:d], a pronunciation which would account for the spelling *food(e)*. (c) **Faihood* pronounced [fe:(h)u:d], with long [u:] in the suffix, might well be represented by Spenser's spelling *feood*; for the more advanced southern pronunciation of ME. *ē* was [e:], so that a southerner could, and probably would if he learnt the word by ear, represent the vowel of the stem by *e* instead of northern *a(i)*. Hall's *feode* would be a mere variant of *feood* (-*hode* still existed as a variant of the suffix -*hood*). (d) **Faihood* pronounced [fe:(h)ud], with short [u] in the suffix, could well be heard by a southerner as containing the diphthong known as ME. *eu*, of which the first element developed in association with ME. *ē* and was therefore presumably long. In the sixteenth century in conservative southern speech ME. *eu* normally had an open first element [ɛ], but close [e] was also used in somewhat more advanced speech; in any event, ME. *eu*, whatever the quality of its first element, would be the nearest southern sound in regular use to the vowels in hiatus in the presumed northern pronunciation [fe:(h)ud]. Substitution of ME. *eu* for these vowels would account for a southern form *feud* with ME. *eu*, which as we saw above is evidenced by the spelling *feaud* and recorded by Hodges and Price just before the final disappearance of ME. *eu* as a distinct sound. (e) But in the most advanced southern speech ME. *eu* was losing its identity in the later sixteenth century (as it already had done in the north) and developing from [ɛu] through [eu] to [iu], where it became indistinguishable from ME. *iu* and ME. [y:], both of which since the fifteenth century had been freely spelt *u* (*ui*). Thus the form *feud*, properly containing (though only by southern sound-substitution) the reflex of ME. *eu*, would in advanced speech change its pronunciation to [fiud], whence later [fju:d] as in Present English, and become capable of the spellings *fude* and *fuid(e)* used respectively by Florio and by Stanyhurst and the 1611 Bible.

E. J. DOBSON

¹ There is evidence that the -*hood* suffix was pronounced both with a long vowel [u:] and with short [u].

'THE DEVONSHIRE MANUSCRIPT' AND ITS MEDIÉVAL FRAGMENTS

PROFESSOR KENNETH MUIR has put all students of early Tudor poetry in his debt by making accessible¹ the hitherto unpublished poems of 'the Devonshire Manuscript' (Brit. Mus. Add. 17492). Many of these bear the initials 'T. H.', identified as Lord Thomas Howard. It is a point of interest which should perhaps be noted that the last dozen poems (Nos. 43-54 inclusive; fols. 89-92) are all fragments from poems of earlier periods, as follows:

- No. 43. 'Womans herte vnto no creweltye' (a stanza in praise of women): Hoccleve, *Letter of Cupid*, ll. 344-50. (Skeat, *Chaucer*, vol. vii, item v.)
- No. 44. 'Ys thys a fayre avaunte? Ys thys honor?' (two stanzas). Ibid., ll. 64-77.
- No. 45. 'Yf all the erthe were parchement scrybable'. This is a variant, turned to praise of women, of st. 7 of the poem, 'Loke wel aboute'. There it applies to 'wommans traitory'. See Skeat, vol. cit., p. 296.
- No. 46. 'O marble herte, and yet more harde, perde.' Sir Richard Roos, *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, ll. 717-24.
- No. 47. 'Alas what shuld yt be to yow [preiudyce].' Ibid., ll. 229-36.
- No. 48. 'How frendly was Medea to Jason.' Hoccleve, *Letter of Cupid*, ll. 302-8.
- No. 49. 'For though I had yow to-morow agayne.' *Anelida and Arcyte*, ll. 308-16.

The last five are from *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book II:

- Nos. 50 and 51. 'Yif yt be so that ye so creuel be.' ll. 337-51. Here Pandarus is arguing with Criseyde, but the change in l. 338 of 'his' to 'my' alters the application.
- No. 52. 'For loue ys yet the moste stormy lyfe.' ll. 778-84.
- No. 53. 'Also wyckyd tonges byn so prest.' ll. 785-91.
- No. 54. 'And who that sayth that for to love ys vyce.' ll. 855-61.

In addition to this final group, an earlier poem, No. 14 (f. 29), 'O very lord, O loue, O god, alas', which because of its proximity in the manuscript to poems by Lord Thomas Howard has been assigned to him, proves to be made up out of extracts also from *Troilus and Criseyde*. It starts with a non-Chaucerian couplet, the commonplace sentiment of the poet's quaking pen; this introduces four stanzas from Book IV, ll. 288-308 and ll. 323-9, the lament of Troilus for the impending departure of Criseyde. The gaps in ll. 7 and 22 are occasioned by the omission of her name; line 21 should read, 'Fle forth out of myn herte and lat it breste'. Two stanzas, one addressed to Criseyde, are omitted (ll. 309-22); but the poem is concluded

¹ *Proc. Leeds Phil. and Lit. Soc., Lit. and Hist. Sect.* vi. iv (May 1947).

by the lines addressed to lovers on Fortune's wheel. Thus a four-stanza poem is carved out of the fine lament to Fortune by Troilus, and prefaced by an uninspired couplet. It was presumably prepared for the compiler's lady, whose name was not, however, inserted.

Thus it is clear that the 'Devonshire Manuscript' was not limited in its contents to poems of the early Tudor period, but that its collector was drawing on productions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, of Chaucer, Hoccleve, and Sir Richard Roos.

ETHEL SEATON

BEN JONSON'S *CHLORIDIA*: FAME AND HER ATTENDANTS

IN the final scene of this masque, Fame is revealed standing on a globe surmounting a hill, on which sit figures representing Poesy, History, Architecture, and Sculpture. Their ostensible reason for attending on Fame is a practical one; they swell the 'quire' of already singing Fountains, Nymphs, and Floods for the grand finale of the entertainment. They are, of course, traditional upholders of Fame. But why mix them in with the 'natural' personifications which symbolize the proper matter of the masque? Thus they have become a problem for the critic. Dr. Simpson finds them 'incongruous and 'puzzling'.¹ A. H. Gilbert finds them unsatisfactory.² 'What indeed', he writes, 'have Fame, Poesy, History, Architecture and Sculpture to do with Chloris the goddess of the flowers?' A fair question. But instead of looking for an explanation, both authorities seize on the questionable hint in Jonson's 'Expostulacion with Inigo Jones',³ and put the blame on Inigo. Dr. Simpson conjectures 'that he had insisted on having a clearly defined part in the invention of *Chloridia*. If the unsuitable ending was Inigo's, and forced upon Jonson, we can understand Jonson's contempt for it'. Clearly, the question of who was responsible must remain conjectural, but this fact should not preclude the possibility of a rational explanation for the ending, whoever thought of it. Perhaps the idea was one for which Jonson himself need not have blushed.

Look closely at what happens. Fame proclaims Chloris (Queen Henrietta Maria) as the guardian of Spring and Flowers, and celebrates her triumph over Hell and Jealousy. That is to say, Fame trumpets precisely what the show has up to then represented. Fame symbolizes the Masque itself. She is the power of the art of masque to give enduring memory, and her

¹ *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, x (Oxford, 1950), p. 682.

² *The Symbolic Persons in the Masques of Ben Jonson* (Durham, N. Carolina, 1948), pp. 22-24.

³ *Works*, viii (1947), 404, ll. 62-63.

attendants are the four arts which comprise Ben's and Inigo's contributions to it. The device brilliantly rounds off the masque with a piece of clever propaganda, directed at their royal patroness, but of a sort common to practically every defence or recommendation of poetry in the period. *Chloridia* is Jonson's last masque, so that there is a certain appropriateness in his celebrating an art which he had successfully practised for more than a quarter of a century.

Fame represents the enduring memory of great actions and personages, 'oft obscur'd by time'. Each of her attendants has one line:

POESY.

Wee that sustaine thee, learned Poesy,

HISTORY.

And I, her sister, seuere History,

ARCHITECTVRE.

With Architecture, who will rayse thee high,

SCVLPTVRE.

And Sculpture, that can keepe thee from to dye,¹

Poetry and History (the 'fable') sum up Jonson's part of the masque. 'Architect' is his general label, slightly contemptuous, for Inigo in the *Expostulacion*,² where it seems also to embrace the arts of design and painting. This particular reading is further supported by the obvious double meaning in Architecture's words, spoken as Fame was being slowly raised into the clouds. Sculpture fits least readily into this scheme of masque-allegory, although the 'prospectives' in *Chloridia* were elaborate enough to warrant its inclusion, notably Chloris's 'arbour fayn'd of Gold-smiths worke, the ornament of which was borne up by *Termes of Satyres*, beautify'd with *Festones*, garlands, and all sorts of fragrant flowers'.³ Moreover, there are special circumstances in connexion with this figure which will be examined later.

This interpretation must be looked on as the surface flow making these figures meaningful in this particular masque, and it by no means pretermits the strong undercurrent of the traditional view of these arts as those which endure longest, or, more important to Jonson, as those which we have actually inherited from the Ancients. For this reason, although the work is for the most part composed of songs, music is not one of them.⁴ And

¹ Ibid., vii. 760, ll. 306-13.

² Ibid., viii. 402-6, ll. 3, 10, 55, 85, 92, 102. D. J. Gordon has amply shown what part the precise connotations of these technical terms played in the literature of their quarrel. See 'Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones', *Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institutes*, xii (1949), 152-78.

³ Ibid., x. 756, ll. 197-200.

⁴ Nor is choreography, despite the fact that in the one masque for which the records exist, the dancing-master received ten pounds more than either Jonson or Jones. See 'Love Freed from Ignorance' in *Works*, x. 529.

the fact that Inigo's contribution to the masque was clearly the less durable—and how Jonson harped on this!—gives grounds for believing that the notion came from Jonson to start with.

Our one outside reference to these figures occurs in the *Expostulation*. Its obscurity is not altogether impenetrable.

Th'ascent of Lady Fame which none could spy
Not they that sided her, Dame Poetry,
Dame History, Dame Architecture too,
And Goody Sculpture, brought with much adoe
To hold her up. O Showes! Showes! Mighty Showes!¹

Read in the proper context of Jonson's antagonism to the 'mechanick' side of production, as against the poetic, its sneering tone clearly applies to some technical shortcoming: possibly the machine for elevating Fame did not work, or, more likely, its visible results were so negligible that even her attendants, standing right beside her, noticed no appreciable ascent. The only point of importance is that Jonson's contempt is not for the figures as such, or, if for any, only for the last. More tangible, however, is the reference to Sculpture as 'brought with much adoe To hold her up'.² From this it may be inferred that a fourth figure was added to the group as a last-minute necessity—we can only guess why—a theory which is lent probability by the appearance of only three supporting figures for Fame in the sketchy design that has been preserved of this tableau,³ and by the unsteady look of Fame balancing precariously on her globe, giving 'hold her up' a tone of utility rather than metaphor.

Finally, would it be too far-fetched, having regard to the intense rivalry between Inigo and Ben, at its climax over the production of this masque, to suggest that the addition of Sculpture would give Inigo the satisfaction of seeing that if Jonson had two figures to represent *his* side of the work, so, now, had he! It might be claimed that Inigo had more reason to underline the enduring aspects of the art of masque than Jonson, as they constituted his own principal, if not sole, claim to fame. I find this improbable. Would Inigo, who had quarrelled so violently with Jonson over the top-billing as Inventor in *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, be likely to accord such obvious pre-eminence to Poetry and History, surely the better part of the 'invention', which so clearly pointed to his rival?

R. I. C. GRAZIANI

¹ *Works*, viii. 403, ll. 35-39.

² The phrase might also be read as referring to all four figures. Such a reading would weaken my case for the exceptional nature of Sculpture, although this is not, as I have made clear, essential to my argument.

³ Simpson and Bell, *Designs by Inigo Jones for Masques and Plays at Court. A descriptive catalogue of drawings* . . . (Oxford, 1924), p. 56, § 82. See also figs. 104 and 105.

THE ENDING OF CLOUGH'S *DIPSYCHUS*¹

At the end of the prose Epilogue to *Dipsychus* (p. 296, l. 90), Clough addresses his uncle:

Good night, dear uncle, good night. Only let me say you six more verses.

The wording does not suit any reference to *Dipsychus Continued*—a fragment of melodrama which, in the form we have it, runs to more than 180 lines of blank verse. What the last sentence naturally suggests is some sort of envoy, to be spoken (like his part of the Epilogue) by Clough in his own person.

In the *Venice* (1850) *Notebook*, apparently contemporary with the first draft of *Dipsychus*, is found the first draft of the short poem the Oxford editors print on p. 75:

It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, Truth is so:
That, howsoe'er I stray and range,
Whate'er I do, Thou dost not change.
I steadier step when I recall
That, if I slip, Thou dost not fall.

This six-line piece of verse, which Clough was prepared to include in the proposed American edition of his poems, is complete in itself, and has a clear relation, in tone and content, to such dramatic utterances of *Dipsychus* within the poem as 'O let me love my love unto myself alone' (p. 240) and 'When the enemy is near thee' (p. 288). It is the only six-line poem of Clough's from this period that survives, apart from the obviously fragmentary 'But that from slow dissolving poms of dawn' (p. 395).

Is it not possible that Clough originally intended this piece to be the 'six more verses' spoken as an envoy to *Dipsychus*? The Epilogue was never re-drafted, after the First Revision; and at some later stage Clough had the unhappy afterthought of a dramatic sequel to a moral poem properly concluded with *Dipsychus*'s submission to the world. If these six lines stood at the end of the prose Epilogue, they would support *Dipsychus*'s reflection in the final scene of the poem (xiii. 33, p. 292):

And we have knowledge wiser than our fears

but would very characteristically be spoken by Clough himself, both to clinch the line of his argument with his uncle, and sum up his own position in regard to one central issue of the poem.

¹ Page-references are to *The Poems of Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry, A. L. P. Norrington, and F. L. Mulhauser (Oxford, 1951).

It may be objected that the tone of these six lines—so highly personal that we cannot imagine them as spoken by anyone but Clough himself—is too solemn and elevated for them to follow appropriately here. But a great deal of the poetic effect of *Dipsychus* is achieved by the deliberate contrast of moral earnestness and facetiousness, of the anguished soul-searching of *Dipsychus* followed by the ironical patter of the Spirit. May not Clough here, after the masterly detachment and liveliness of the prose Epilogue, have wanted to reverse the earlier pattern, and switch back to a serious summing-up of his young man's final position? The statement of conditional faith made with such concentrated emphasis in 'It fortifies my soul' seems to me to follow logically enough from the new topic ('the over-excitation of the religious sense') deliberately introduced by Clough in ll. 80–86 of the Epilogue. In any case, these six unattached lines are something of a mystery: as many have felt, and as Mr. A. L. P. Norrington suggests privately, 'they do seem to need, or refer to, some context outside themselves'. Is there any context in Clough as appropriate as *Dipsychus*, of which *Easter Day* was clearly the germ, though the debate in the longer poem was carried into other territory?

JAMES BERTRAM

REVIEWS

Runica Manuscripta. The English Tradition. By R. DEROLEZ. Pp. lxiv+455, 8 plates (Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren. 118^e Aflevering). Brugge: De Tempel, 1954. No price given.

The study of manuscript runes is not the only aspect of English runology that has long been neglected. It is thirteen years since Joan Blomfield examined 'the transformation of the runic system in the period VIII-XII', but her concern was primarily with the supposed relationship between runes and the Gothic alphabet and only secondarily with runic manuscripts for their own sake.¹ Dr. Derolez's book reverses this order. His principal aim is the study of all known *futhorcs* and runic alphabets preserved in English and continental manuscripts, and, although in this case not exhaustively, of non-alphabetic manuscript runes. In its factual material the book inspires confidence from the start; manuscripts and their contents are fully described and all runic forms are examined down to minute detail and accompanied by figures which bear the imprint of painstaking accuracy. Eleven manuscripts are illustrated on photographic plates.

That such a book has long been wanting needs no stressing, especially as its value extends well beyond runic research into fields of medieval alphabet lore and culture generally which still await further exploration. The manuscript survival of *futhorcs* and runic alphabets many generations after runes ceased to be a practical script in England has long been regarded as a commonplace, albeit a dangerous commonplace, for it has led scholars into often unwarranted conclusions. Dr. Derolez rightly casts doubt, for example, upon the too facile association of a few famous names like those of Alcuin, Hrabanus Maurus, Isidore, Bede, with runic tradition: 'Why should they—the highest representatives of Christian education of their period—have wasted so much of their time on such *nugae*?' (p. 174). After studying the book with its ample evidence of so much erratic and ignorant transmission the conclusion is obvious that they 'cannot be proved to have taken an active part in the history of manuscript runes' (p. 425).

But such conclusions, valuable as they are, are only sidelights. The main portion of the book is a systematic study of *futhorcs* and runic alphabets, including those forming part of the *Isruna* tract (ch. II), and of the *De Inventionem Litterarum* treatise (ch. IV). Some of the manuscript material examined by Dr. Derolez has not been published before, e.g. the fragmentary *futhorc* in Ghent, Universiteitsbibliotheek MS. 306, with its rare *c*-rune; other manuscripts studied by him have hitherto received little attention from runologists. From a survey as systematic and painstaking as this several conclusions can safely be drawn: the different strains of tradition accounting for the various continental *futhorcs* are clearly demonstrated, and Dr. Derolez rightly stresses the 'bookish'

¹ J. Blomfield, 'Runes and the Gothic Alphabet', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, xii (1941-2), 177-94, 209-31.

character of the continental runic alphabets. All this 'points evidently to the scholar's study; it is utterly remote from runic tradition' (p. 430). No one will wish to quarrel with this as far as continental tradition is concerned. But in England runic tradition was still alive, demonstrably so as late as the ninth century, possibly even the early tenth. What then were the reasons for this Anglo-Saxon 'export' of runes to the Continent? Hardly an antiquarian interest, and to say that 'runes were part of the intellectual pattern' (p. 426) is a description rather than an explanation.

On the other hand, Dr. Derolez makes some valuable suggestions which merit further study, e.g. of Irish influence on some of the *futhorcs* and especially the *Isruna* tract. In the case of the *De Inventione* treatise, however, one feels that he is perhaps too keen to demonstrate Old Norse influence. The somewhat dogmatic conclusion that 'some information on Norse runes and on conditions in the North must also have been available' (p. 374) in a German centre with strong Anglo-Saxon influence is here based on very slender evidence.

Other criticisms might be voiced, but happily they are minor ones, such as the inconsistency on p. 391, where the remark that a rune-name 'was so essentially a part of the rune, that it (or its meaning) could not be changed arbitrarily' is followed by the equating of Cynewulf's *c* with *cynn*. Similarly, if we accept this rule governing rune-names, as I think we must, we cannot very well relate Nemnivus's *guichr* 'impétueux, colère' with OE. *cen*, as Dr. Derolez suggests, although admittedly tentatively, on p. 159.

But it seems hardly gracious to carp at this valuable and stimulating work in this manner, for the book is full of good things. The lengthy introduction contains a useful summary of runic development and runological history with particular reference to the study of *runic manuscripta*. In his examination of the individual manuscripts Dr. Derolez invariably relates the *futhorcs* or alphabets to the remaining contents of the various codices, thereby adducing tangible evidence of the 'bookish' nature of the material and its distance from genuine runic tradition. The descriptions, histories, present locations, and possible relationships of the manuscripts cannot but be of help to other workers in this field, and one welcomes such features as the dropping of out-of-date nomenclature as in the case of the famous Vienna MS. 795 with its unhappily common but unwarranted association of the *futhorc* and Gothic alphabets with Alcuin or Salzburg.¹ The final chapter of the book, devoted to non-alphabetic *runic manuscripta*, although the shortest, covers a wider field than the others: runes used as additional letters; runes substituted for their names; runes used as reference marks, quire marks, &c.; scribal signatures and notes, titles, short scribbles, &c., in runes. The author modestly describes this chapter 'as a first rough map of this territory, to be completed as more information becomes available' (p. 386). It is unfortunate that the diversity of this material and the impracticability of an exhaustive study within the scope of the present volume preclude any definite conclusions concerning the place of such usages within English runic tradition. For here most probably we shall have to turn to meet the author's final challenge 'that the gap

¹ Cf., for example, Arntz, *Handbuch der Runenkunde*, 2nd edn. (Halle, 1944), p. 122: 'Die Runenreihe der Salzburg-Wiener-Alkuinhandschrift'.

between manuscript and epigraphical runes will be hard to bridge' (p. 431). Have we not in such usages as Cynewulf's or that of *The Husband's Message* and some of the Riddles clear evidence of a living tradition in the process of becoming 'bookish'? And despite Dr. Derolez's view to the contrary one feels inclined to consider the scribal signatures in B.M. Harley MS. 1772, Valenciennes MS. 59, and others in a similar light. But whatever results further research may yield in this field, runologists and others will be heavily indebted to Dr. Derolez's work for a long time to come, and will hope that his projected study of the Old Norse *runica manuscripta* may be completed before long.

A final word of appreciation is due to the publishers and printers for producing, in a foreign language and clearly beset with typographical pitfalls, a volume which it is a pleasure to handle. Hardly any misprints have been overlooked, and these are minor ones: on p. 231, l. 10; p. 267, l. 23; p. 277, l. 25; p. 391, n. 1, ll. 6 and 7; and on p. liii the footnotes have gone awry.

RALPH W. V. ELLIOTT

Hiatus in English. By AASTA STENE. Pp. 102 (Anglistica 3). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. Dan. Kr. 13.50.

What Dr. Stene calls a *hiatus context* occurs when a word which ends with a vowel is followed in utterance by another word which begins with a vowel. In some languages such a juxtaposition raises no problem, and words in hiatus contexts are left as they are; in others, including English, such contexts are avoided by means of various 'antihiatic' devices. It is the purpose of the present work to describe these devices in modern English; to compare them with those of cognate languages and past forms of English; and to relate the phenomena associated with hiatus to other 'prosodic' features of the language.

Dr. Stene is principally concerned with the present-day 'Received Pronunciation' of England, in which hiatus is more of an issue than it is in most other types of English. The following are examples of words which may occur in hiatus context: *far, better, a, the, to, him*. If the last of these is preceded by a word ending in a vowel, or the rest of them followed by a word beginning with a vowel, a 'maximum form' of the word is normally used, characterized either by the addition of a phoneme (*h, r, or n*) or by a change in vowel quality. English provides here a striking contrast with some of the other Germanic languages: in Norwegian it is a 'minimum form' of the word which is characteristic of hiatus contexts, for unstressed final syllables tend to be elided in this position; in Swedish, hiatus contexts are left undisturbed (owing, Dr. Stene thinks, to certain rhythmic features of the language); in German a 'non-phonemic hiatus breaker'—a glottal stop—is used. It would have been interesting to have also a comparison with Dutch, which appears to use an anti-hiatic device (linking and intrusive *n*) comparable to the English use of *r*.

American and other types of English are briefly dealt with. Scots, however, gets no more than a bare mention, which is a pity, since its catenation habits seem to be very different from those of the rest of the English-speaking world.

Very nearly half the book deals with the historical aspects of English catenation,

in which considerable changes have taken place: in OE., for instance, hiatus was not an issue at all; in ME. it was dealt with either by elision or by the use of *-n* as a hiatus-breaker; for the last 200 years, linking *r* has been the main anti-hiatic device. Associated with these changes, the author believes, were changes in the loudness, tempo, and rhythm of utterance. The problem of hiatus brings out the tension between the phrase and the word: the phrase must be a close-knit unit, yet the identity of the words composing it must be preserved. English has succeeded in evolving a system of handling hiatus which reconciles these apparently conflicting aims of utterance. As Dr. Stene writes, 'One may be allowed to register that the English genius for compromise, and for achieving a great deal with a minimum of effort, even extends to phonological patterns.'

It is clear that Dr. Stene's studies in prosodic aspects of English have extended far beyond juncture and catenation, and the reader of the present most interesting work will look forward with eagerness to further publication of her discoveries and conclusions.

DAVID ABERCROMBIE

The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry. By RANDOLPH QUIRK.

Pp. xiv + 150 (Yale Studies in English 124). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 32s. net.

Dr. Quirk has produced a thorough study of the concessive idea in Old English verse. The more limited material has enabled him to be more exhaustive than was Miss J. M. Burnham in her *Concessive Constructions in Old English Prose*, published in 1911 in the same series, but he has profited much from that work, and from Miss Burnham's personal advice. It will be a pleasure to all OE. scholars that Miss Burnham has been able to take a lively interest in Dr. Quirk's researches, published forty-three years after her own.

Quirk has examined not only the use of *peah* in principal and subordinate clauses, but also all the other mediums through which concession is expressed in OE. verse. His work will be invaluable to all close students of OE. poetic usage, but it is to be deplored that he was not able to quote his material in full in the manner which makes Behre's *The Subjunctive in OE. Poetry* a perpetual source of instruction and delight. Even if this were considered too costly, line-references should certainly have been given in full for at least the less common constructions. Quirk often gives only the distribution in texts of the construction under discussion. For example, he says (p. 104), 'relative members with concessive function occur in OE. verse 82 times . . . distributed as follows: Gen 4 (2 in Gen B), Ex 1, Dan 3, . . .'. But of the eighty-two examples references are given to three only. This method of presentment leaves the reader without the means to test the author's conclusions, and so greatly reduces the value of the book.

Quirk's approach to his subject is not to be seriously criticized. He is to be congratulated on the cautious and secondary place he gives to syntactic analysis by aid of Latin sources, and his realization (p. 2) that a translator is not bound to follow his original closely. Here he contrasts favourably with the late S. O.

Andrew, and in other matters he shows himself well able to separate the undoubted grain from the chaff in the work of that perplexing scholar (e.g. p. 77). Perhaps some would have been grateful for a reminder from Quirk of the highly rectional syntactic state of OE.: it is generally the words used, not the sense, which govern the grammar of a clause. *peah* takes the subjunctive in subordinate clauses by rule, and quite independently of the reality of the concession. This Quirk clearly shows (p. 40), but when he passes on to indefinite concessive relative and local clauses, he omits to indicate that the syntax of these is unaffected by their being concessive. He even (pp. 100-1) appears to regard the subjunctive of some passages (*Jul.* 87, *Gen.* 2723, *Ex.* 271, *And.* 223) as indicating their concessive meaning, although it is in all these cases due to the fact that the principal clause contains an imperative or (once, *Ex.* 271) a subjunctive. It would have been wise to remind readers of what is perhaps the most far-reaching rule of OE. syntax—viz. that relative clauses (including clauses of time and place), clauses of result, *swa* clauses, and clauses expressing real positive conditions¹ take the subjunctive when the principal clause contains an imperative, a subjunctive, or a negated indicative.²

A fault of the special investigator which Quirk does not entirely escape is to dwell on peculiarities of the construction which he is examining, without reminding the reader that they are shared by other constructions. One might instance his demonstration of the variety of the word-order of compound tenses in concessive clauses (pp. 24-25). This would, of course, be paralleled in clauses of almost every other type. Similarly, what is said on p. 35 about the handling of parallel concessive elements in verse might be said of many other parallel elements.

Quirk might have gained by more preliminary clearance of the ground to clarify the nature of his material. This is threefold. (1) There are clauses (e.g. those with *hwæpre*, and most with *peah*) which are grammatically concessive and concessive in sense. (2) Many clauses are not grammatically concessive, but have another grammatical function, but in their context convey a concessive idea. This is well stated by Quirk of concessive-equivalent clauses of manner (p. 108), but it would apply to many other concessive-equivalents (e.g. relative, temporal, and local clauses, and principal clauses before *ac* clauses). (3) Some clauses are introduced by a conjunction substituted for the one which would be normally used. This device is clearly an OE. rhetorical figure, i.e. a use of language in a manner not obvious or ordinary (Quintilian ix. 1. 4). The chief instances in

¹ Clauses expressing unreal conditions or negated real conditions require the subjunctive whatever the nature of the principal clause.

² Conversely, comparative clauses with *þonne*, and temporal clauses with *ær*, take the subjunctive only after a positive indicative principal clause. Exceptions are largely due to the use of familiar sentence-patterns in positions not syntactically justified, e.g. *ær he age* (*Wand.* 64), *þonne hit men duge* (*Guth.* 355), *than him tharf sie* (*Bede's Death Song* 2), all in dependence upon negated clauses. It may be noted that, for the purposes of these rules, a positive real question counts as positive, but a positive rhetorical question as virtually a negated statement: contrast *And.* 1344 *þæt eow swa lyt gespeow*, with *ibid.* 1373, *þæt he þe alyse* . . ., both clauses of result, but the former after a real, the latter after a rhetorical question.

Quirk's field are: (a) The concessive use of the *ond* clause (pp. 54-58). This is an undoubted OE. idiom, frequent in the *Chronicle*, e.g. 905, *ond seofon ærendra-can he him hæfde to asend*, 'though he had sent seven messengers to them'. Similar constructions occur in Latin, e.g. *sed abest . . . coniunx, nec adhuc a litore longe est*, 'but his wife was not present, though she was not yet far from land' (Luc. viii. 741-2). But Quirk does not clearly distinguish this usage from sentences where the principal clause acquires concessive meaning, and which fall under 2 above.¹ Such is *Gen.* 810, *Hwilum of heofnum hate scineð, blicð þeos beorhte sunne, and we her baru standað*, 'though the bright sun shines hotly and gleams, we stand here naked'; other examples are *Guth.* 60, *Chr. and Sat.* 405, and a number of passages from ME. and ModE. poems, all quoted by Quirk. Similar is Latin *non in gemitus . . . dolorem effudit, iustaque furens pietate profatur*, 'although he did not pour his sorrow forth in groans, enraged by due regard he said . . .' (Luc. ix. 146-7). (b) Noun clauses with *peah* for *þæt*: these are found in prose only (p. 116; Burnham, pp. 33-34). Originally they would imply that the clause denoted something contrary to expectation, then they would become used for mere variety of expression. (c) Clauses in which the concessive force of *peah* is much reduced or entirely absent (p. 39).² (d) Clauses in which *peah* has a pregnant force, 'even though', and stands for *peah*+*furðum* or some other such expression (pp. 37-38).

A few individual points may be discussed, following the order in which they arise in the book. It is not surprising that Quirk (pp. 39-40) is unable to establish a distinction between *peah* in conjunctival function and *peah þe*, for here *þe* is not a sense-bearing word, but a particle indicating that the preceding word is a conjunction, not an adverb. It is, of course, a familiar function of *þe* to show that a preceding word or phrase is of subordinating force, whether conjunctival or relational, e.g. *op þe, for þæm þe, se þe*.

In dealing with concessive *ac* Quirk is ill served by his method of presenting his material. He states (p. 50) that there are thirty instances in verse of *ac* with a 'non-concessive but perhaps closely related function'. Fifteen of these are the occurrences of *ac* as a speech-introducing formula in *Solomon and Saturn*, but the reader is given no clue to where the others are, although this is just the sort

¹ It is also unclear what Quirk means by his statement (p. 56) that *ond* is a co-ordinator not a subordinator. Every conjunction in early West Germanic languages is a subordinator, if this term means a clause-introducer which is followed by subordinate word-order. For a review of the evidence for this in OE. see H. Kuhn, 'Zur wortstellung und -betonung im algermanischen', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, lvii (1933), 63. Of course, if *ond* were not a 'subordinator', it would be an adverb and would take inversion at least sometimes, whereas it will not tolerate inversion even in commands and questions (see S. O. Andrew, *Syntax and Style in Old English* (Cambridge, 1940), p. 50). Inversion after *ond*, i.e. treatment of it as an adverb, is late, rare, and barbarous, e.g. *Chronicle* 1048 (E) *and wearð se cyng swyþe gram*.

² There is no evidence that *peah* can be used for *gif*. Of two passages advanced by Quirk, p. 38 and footnote, that from the *Laws* means 'let the heirs answer, as the man would have to do himself, even though he were alive'; that from *Orosius* means 'and even though you put down two vessels, they so work that one is frozen', for the implication is that this was an extremely hard test, showing that it was not natural conditions which caused the freezing. Hence these passages belong to (d) above.

of point one would wish to judge for oneself. As regards the instances in *Solomon and Saturn*, it is more probable that the usually 'elliptically concessive' *ac* is sometimes misused (like *forþon* in the *Seafarer*, see below) than that *ac* is ever merely a sign of a change of subject.¹

Quirk devotes a section (pp. 58-61) to the formulaic *forþon* which introduces several divisions of the *Seafarer*. He concludes that it may be reasonably interpreted as concessive in ll. 33, 39, 58, and 64, while having causal force elsewhere. It is, however, to be doubted if the poet would expect his audience to follow such an alternation between the normal meaning of the word and a highly abnormal one.² No type of OE. poetry except epic narrative is extant in sufficient quantity for us to feel that we can in some measure recover its conventions. But it may be that in some kinds of poetry stanzas linked in a chain of argument could each begin *forþon* 'therefore'. Formulae are apt to be misused by later wielders of a poetical tradition, and *forþon* might very probably become an almost meaningless introductory word.³ One may compare the adverbs *παραβλήδην* and *ὕποβλήδην*: they are used by Homer in introducing speeches, and appear to mean respectively 'maliciously' and 'by way of interruption', but in Apollonius of Rhodes they mean merely 'in answer', and can be used to introduce speeches without regard to their circumstances or content.

The couplet *Beow.* 168-9 hardly deserves the serious discussion given to it by Quirk (p. 74, footnote): see J. R. R. Tolkien, *Beowulf: the Monsters and the Critics* (London, 1936), p. 52, note 34.

Quirk discusses (pp. 88-90) the possibility of a concessive use of *gif*. Since he disposes of those in *Charm* IV, we are left with *Gen.* 661 and *Rid.* 72, 17. In the latter passage *gif* may mean 'on occasions when', rather than 'even if'. Hence we are left with the passage from *Gen. B*, a poem which has various syntactic abnormalities,⁴ and could not in any event be regarded as a guide to OE. usage in view of its origin, as Quirk duly stresses (p. 90).

How many OE. *swa* clauses can be regarded as concessive equivalents is a delicate and subjective question. E. E. Ericson admits only five instances in verse (*The use of swa in Old English* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 62-63), but Quirk (p. 109) would increase the figure to thirty-two: *suo more*, he gives the distribution of these, but adds references to two only, so the reader cannot judge if his remarkable deviation from Ericson is judicious.

In dealing with concessive-equivalent temporal clauses, Quirk (p. 114) discusses the use of the subjunctive in three passages, but he has mistaken the nature of two of these (*Jud.* i. 76; *Bo.* 21. 25), for they are not temporal but comparative

¹ Quirk's parallels from Modern English are here not convincing.

² Other evidence for concessive *forþon* is poor. The gloss *forþon uel hweþre for uero* contrasts two possible renderings of *uero* but does not equate them. Cases of *forþon* translating *autem* or *sed* reflect freedom of rendering. In the passages quoted by Burnham (p. 31), *forþon* is not truly correlative with *þeah*, but means 'for that reason'. Quirk has shown all possible instances in verse outside the *Seafarer* to be suspect.

³ On the other hand, *hweþre* in *Dream of the Rood* always has concessive feeling, despite Quirk (pp. 45-46).

⁴ e.g. purely temporal *swa*, l. 552. Normally, *swa* is used of time only as an equivalent of *sona swa* (see Bosworth-Toller, Supp., *swa* v. 8), but this would be forced in *Gen.* 552.

ponne clauses, taking the subjunctive normally because they depend upon positive indicative clauses.¹

He classes *Crist* 1493 as a concessive-equivalent local clause, and hence he is puzzled by its subjunctive (p. 115). It is, however, an unfulfilled condition (with the frequent *pær* 'if'), and hence takes the subjunctive normally.

In an interesting section (pp. 123-6) on the implication of 'even' without a word to express it, Quirk might have added *lytle hwile*, *Beow.* 2030, correctly translated by C. L. Wrenn, wisely ignoring Klaeber's misgivings, '[even] for a little while'. Similar implication is found in Latin verse, e.g. *Luc.* viii. 402-3, *non ullis exceptos legibus audet concubitus*, where the thought is that such unions are too horrible to be specified even in laws.

Although Quirk's bibliography is selective, he might well have mentioned G. Hotz, *On the use of the subjunctive mood in Anglo-Saxon* (Zürich, 1882), a small book by a forgotten scholar who had remarkably little to learn about the syntactic structure of OE., and which is the best introduction to that subject.

A. CAMPBELL

Cambridge Middle English Lyrics. Edited by HENRY A. PERSON. Pp. v+92. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1953. \$2.50.

This collection consists of seventy poems from manuscripts in Cambridge libraries. Sixty of these have not hitherto been printed (though variants of several have been), and that is the chief justification for the book. The contents are evenly divided between religious and secular items; the former including nine portions of the missal rendered into English verses that can hardly be called lyrics on any definition, the latter being subdivided into love songs, satirical pieces, gnomic sayings, and riddles. The Notes sometimes elucidate the text, and sometimes refer to variant versions; but they ignore many of the difficulties and at least one interesting variant, viz. that of the Latin sections of no. 58 ('Of the iiij Complexions') found in Balliol MS. 354, no. 110: if *cantans* is the right reading in l. 8 (Balliol has *cautus*, according to Diboski), it accounts for *chauntere* in l. 12, which Robbins (*Fifteenth Century Secular Lyrics*, p. 251) took to be a rhyme-substitute for *champioun* in other versions; whilst for *perditus*, l. 20, Balliol has *prodigus*, and for *eves*, l. 31, [*h*]ebes (for *terdus*, *ibid.*, read *tardus*).

The comments on etymological points are casual and sometimes inexact (e.g. *thra* 'keen' is derived from 'OE. *thrauu*', and *poo* 'peacock' from 'OE. *pāwas*'); forms like the plural *hende* (rhyming with *lende* in no. 4—a Northern text, like the cognate version in Arundel 285) go unregarded. So do *mobul*, no. 15, l. 13 (read *nobul*; cf. the Latin *tam nobilis*), *sen*, *ibid.*, l. 45 (? = 'sign', q.v. in *O.E.D.*, 5. a), *ageet*, no. 53, l. 163 (= 'goes away'), *gewit*, no. 40, l. 4 (? read *gewirt* for *gart*), &c.; *whos*, no. 53, l. 163, is probably misinterpreted: it is the coat, not its maker,

¹ The third one, *Ps.* 119. 6, is irregular, and probably due to careless composition. The poet (a crude worker) meant to follow *ponne ic him spedlice to spræce ond hi lærde*, with a negative principal clause with some such idea as 'they spared me not', but finally wrote the positive *ðonne me . . . ealle onfuhtan*, leaving *spræce* unjustifiable, though the indifferently indicative or subjunctive *lærde* softens the construction.

'whos colour is ryght blak'. *Lonsom*, no. 68, l. 12, must be a misreading for *lousom*; so that we may add *lovesom lere* to the many other alliterative phrases surviving in these poems, e.g. *rote and rynde, dawbe or dyke, boune and bette, strong to stey*.

What a scribe has joined together Mr. Person has not dared to sunder, so that forms like *turnepe* (= *turne pe*), *ygyll* (? = 'in guile'), *avederes* (? = *have deres*, no. 54, l. 5) may cause trouble. Many allusions in the poems still require elucidation. The *in principio* of the poem about Friars (no. 51) should be linked with l. 254 of Chaucer's Prologue, and ll. 14-16 of the same poem require references to 2 Tim. iii. 6 and 1 Pet. v. 8. *Regency* (no. 53, l. 42) must refer to the period for which an M.A. was required to rule over disputations (a sense not recorded in *O.E.D.*). But why do men cry 'seynt Barbara' at loosing of the gown, in no. 49? Are they exclaiming at its colour, or invoking her against sudden death?

J. A. W. BENNETT

Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance. By JOHN BUXTON. Pp. xi+284. London: Macmillan, 1954. 18s. net.

Mr. Buxton's purpose in writing this book was twofold: to discover what it was that made Sidney the perfect patron of poetry and learning; and to

follow the broad flood of poetry that existed by 1630 back to a common source. So the poets themselves saw their work. My purpose has been to see with their eyes, and thereby to restore perspective to the scene of the English Renaissance.

(p. 256)

The two aims are united by regarding the whole development of English poetry as stemming from Sidney. The first aim has involved a chronological study of Sidney's life. Something of his interest in politics appears in the account of his continental tour, during which, as Mr. Buxton says, Sidney did not give much thought to poetry. But once he is back in England, Mr. Buxton confines himself to an account of his influence on the literary and intellectual life of the time—even though he realizes that such a division is quite arbitrary, and would have seemed so to Sidney. In consequence, the reader of this book gets the impression that from 1575 to 1586 Sidney gave most of his time to poetry and learning. Naturally the poets who wrote elegies on Sidney stressed the patron and the man of letters; this is not the emphasis of Greville's *Life*.

Mr. Buxton gives a fuller survey of the many works dedicated to Sidney than has been available hitherto, and his account of the foreign works, with many particulars drawn from such sources as de L'Écluse's correspondence preserved in the library of the University of Leiden, is most valuable. He is aware that men dedicate their books to patrons for a variety of motives including self-glorification, self-advertisement, and the hope of gain. Sidney was received on the Continent as a future statesman, and the many writers and scholars who met him cannot have been unaware that he was the nephew and heir to the powerful Earl of Leicester. This might account for the dedications by men who did not know him

personally such as Daneau and, amongst the English, Gosson and John Stell; but can hardly be held responsible for the homage of such men as Estienne, and for the affection he inspired in Languet. As Mr. Buxton amply demonstrates, much of Sidney's success was due to his personal charm. Sidney was never a rich man, and Mr. Buxton produces no evidence of his supporting poets beyond paying for Abraham Fraunce's education at Cambridge (p. 46) and giving Richard Robinson four angels for a dedication in 1579 (p. 1). But the true patron, according to Mr. Buxton, does not give money, but example and encouragement. This Sidney was particularly fitted to do: 'because Sidney was himself a skilled and gifted poet he was so well able to be a stimulating patron of others' (p. 104). Sidney's only extant letter acknowledging a dedication (by William Temple) is, indeed, as Mr. Buxton says, 'gracious and encouraging'. His relations with his senior, Dyer, and his contemporary, Fulke Greville, would seem to have been rather those of a group of friends experimenting together in the New Poetry than of a patron to poets. (Both Dyer and Greville figure in Mr. Buxton's roll of patrons.) Mr. Buxton dismisses the idea of an areopagus as the joke between Spenser and Harvey it clearly was. But the question of Sidney's relations with Spenser is more difficult. Mr. Buxton assembles all the evidence in support of the contention that Sidney was, as Spenser said, 'the hope of all learned men, and the patron of my young Muses'. Spenser was in London by the summer of 1579, and by the autumn he was able to inform Harvey that he was received with some use of familiarity by Dyer and Sidney. But before that time

We cannot be certain of any dates, except that Spenser knew Sidney well enough by April 1579 to feel sure that he would accept the dedication of the first great work of the New Poetry. (p. 118)

This dedication of *The Shepheardes Calender* to Sidney scarcely warrants the assertion on the same page that Spenser joined Sidney's group late in 1578 or early in 1579; or the statement on p. 128 that *The Shepheardes Calender* was 'written for the most part, if not entirely, during his intercourse with Sidney'. In order to fit Spenser into the stream of poetry flowing from the Sidneian well-head, Mr. Buxton has to regard *The Shepheardes Calender* as drawing its inspiration from the *Arcadia* poems. It would, perhaps, have been strange if Sidney and Spenser in 1578 and 1579 were both engaged in writing pastoral poems in experimental metres without either being aware of the other's activities; and it may be that Spenser made some changes in *The Shepheardes Calender* after 'E.K.' wrote his prefatory letter in April and before the work was entered in the Stationers' Register in December 1579.

The statement that Sidney set Spenser to write *The Faerie Queene* rests on 'W.L.'s' remarks in his prefatory poem, and Spenser's own statement that it was Sidney 'who first my Muse, did lift out of the flore'. Spenser first refers to the work by name in April 1580 when his close association with Sidney had begun. But that he was already considering an epic with Queen Elizabeth I (or possibly Leicester) as a central character when he wrote *The Shepheardes Calender* is suggested by the October Eclogue, ll. 43-54, and 'E.K.'s' gloss. The suggestion that Sidney helped Spenser in August 1580 to obtain the post of secretary to

Lord Grey de Wilton in Ireland is plausible, but not proven. Thereafter, during the years in which Spenser was working on *The Faerie Queene*, there is no evidence that the two poets kept in touch—though Spenser felt free to invoke the patronage of the Countess of Pembroke after Sidney's death. But so did a great many other poets: by reason of her husband's wealth she was able to give financial support to poets on a scale far beyond Sidney's means. Her patronage extended to William Browne, John Davies of Hereford, Thomas Howell, Nicholas Breton, and many other poets.

Mr. Buxton lists (p. 235) among the books dedicated to the Countess by Nicholas Breton '*The Countesse of Pembrookes Passion*, a poem on Christ's Passion which was written before 1600, but which remained unpublished until 1853'. In fact the poem was printed as *The Passions of the Spirit* in 1594 by Thomas Este, who signs the dedication to Mrs. Mary Houghton.¹ May not the Countess have been offended by this appearance in print of a poem previously written for her? Mr. Buxton (p. 234) agrees that in *Wits Trenchmour* (1597) Breton is describing Wilton, but does not think that Breton refers to himself as the poor gentleman who fell out of favour, 'for when he wrote, in 1597, he had enjoyed Lady Pembroke's patronage for at least five years'. But between *The Pilgrimage To Paradise, Ioyned With The Countesse of Penbrookes loue* (1592) and *Auspicante Iehoua. Maries Exercise*, which appeared in 1597 shortly after the indirect appeal to her in *Wits Trenchmour*, Breton dedicated no books to the Countess, and it does seem likely that he was out of favour during these years.

As Mr. Buxton extends his survey of patronage to the death of the Earl of Pembroke in 1630, he might perhaps have made a passing reference to Prince Henry, whose patronage of learning and poetry was extensive, and whose death in 1612 was lamented in almost as many elegies as was Sidney's. Another omission, surprising in that he was first a poet and then a patron, is Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, whose 'Induction' is surely worth mentioning in any assessment of the English poetry written before Spenser and Sidney.

As one would expect, some of the most satisfactory parts of Mr. Buxton's book are his discussions of Sidney's own poetry, and the quotations from little-known poems such as William Smith's 'A New-yeares gulfte made upon certen Flowers', which is still in manuscript. Mr. Buxton is probably right to connect Sidney's experiments in quantitative verse with an interest in the experiments of de Baïf's Academy which were designed to fit poetry to music. But it is not certain that the *Arcadia* poems were in fact written with a musical setting in view. When Sidney specified accompanying instruments and added an elaborate framework of singing shepherds, he may simply have been creating the illusion of sung lyrics. Mr. Buxton states that

In the Queen's College manuscript of the *Arcadia* there is an interesting passage, missing from other copies, which well illustrates Sidney's appreciation of the problems involved in writing songs. (p. 115)

He then quotes from the incomplete transcript given by Zandvoort.² The passage

¹ See *Poems of Nicholas Breton*, ed. Robertson (Liverpool, 1952), pp. lv-lvii.

² R. W. Zandvoort, *Sidney's Arcadia* (Amsterdam, 1929), pp. 11-12.

appears also in a slightly better text in the manuscript in Jesus College (MS. 150), and a version based on a collation of the two manuscripts has been printed by Professor Ringler.¹ Mr. Ringler also prints a paragraph on the quantities of English syllables headed 'Nota' which appears in the margin written opposite the poem 'Fortune, Nature, Love' in the St. John's College, Cambridge, manuscript of the *Arcadia* (MS. 308). He comments, 'This note, obviously, is Sidney's version of "Maister Drant's rules".' Mr. Buxton might have found it a useful aid to the interpretation of these rules, which 'no longer exist but can be deduced from references in letters of Spenser and Harvey, and from the practical experiments which they and Sidney made' (p. 117).

Mr. Buxton does not always seem aware in one chapter what he is going to write, or has written, in another. On p. 134 he states that to the Countess of Pembroke

the *Arcadia* remained always a romance, written mostly in her company and always for her delight, and she preferred it so, rather than in Fulke Greville's recension, with chapter headings that invite the reader to interpret the romance as a moral allegory. Her judgment was certainly right, as we can see from Sidney's advice to her to read it at her idle times, and in his promise to his brother Robert to send him his 'toyfull book'. This book, casually put together at odd moments for the private amusement of a dearly loved sister, became a model for English prose style through nearly a hundred years.

The book which became a model was not, of course, the *Old Arcadia* which remained in manuscript until 1926, but the folio edition which was prepared under the supervision of the Countess of Pembroke and first published in 1593. Far from spurning Sidney's revised version of Books I-III (unfinished) printed in 1590 from Greville's manuscript, the Countess reprinted it, with the omission of the editorial chapter-headings, and completed the work with Books III-V of the *Old Arcadia* (with some changes). But of this and of all the details concerning the editing of the *Arcadia* in 1590 and 1593 Mr. Buxton shows full awareness on pp. 178-82. What he does not seem to appreciate, and I think it is central to an understanding of his artistic development, is Sidney's seriousness of intention and execution in the new *Arcadia*, which is not a romance but, as C. S. Lewis says, an 'Arcadian epic'; and furthermore

It was only the conventional modesty of a 'gentle' author that led Sidney to describe even his first cancelled version as a 'toyfull booke'; and to the real *Arcadia* such words have no application at all.²

The book is enlivened by fifteen illustrations. Mr. Buxton has perhaps been too anxious to be different in choosing the engraving by I. de Courbes from the French translation of the *Arcadia* by J. Baudoin (1624) as his sole portrait of Sidney (apart from the sketch of Sidney's portrait in the Bodleian Library frieze on the dust-cover); and an engraving from L. Alessandri's Italian translation (1659) as his portrait of the Countess of Pembroke. The better-known and

¹ W. Ringler, 'Maister Drant's Rules', *Ph.Q.*, xxix (1950), pp. 70-74.

² C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 335, 336.

contemporary portraits reproduced in Mona Wilson's *Sidney* bring their subjects closer to us. No. 12, 'The Countess of Bedford: Drawing by Mathys van den Bergh after miniature by Peter Oliver', is rather puzzling; for this drawing appeared in the catalogue of the exhibition of works by Nicholas Hilliard and Isaac Oliver held at the Victoria and Albert Museum as '200. Called "LUCY HARINGTON, Countess of Bedford"'. . . . The preliminary drawing for No. 165¹; and the entry for No. 165 runs:

Called 'LUCY HARINGTON, Countess of Bedford' (d. 1627) *signed with monogram I O.* One of the finest miniatures by Isaac Oliver. His pen and ink study for it is also in the Fitzwilliam Museum.²

Unless there are reasons, despite the signature 'I. O.', for now ascribing the miniature to Isaac's son Peter, and for stating that the drawing is taken by van den Bergh from the miniature rather than being the artist's own preliminary sketch, and, more importantly for our purpose, unless there is new evidence for regarding this with more certainty as a portrait of the Countess of Bedford (it bears little resemblance to other portraits of her), would it not have been preferable to reproduce one of the authenticated portraits at Woburn, or, to match the other engraved portraits and bring in the verses of Nicholas Breton, the engraving by Simon Van Der Passe in the British Museum?

J. R.

Endeavors of Art: A study of form in Elizabethan drama. By MADELEINE DORAN. Pp. xiv+482. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954. \$6.00.

Endeavors of Art is an extremely valuable book which might easily be underrated. It combines obvious scholarship with a great deal of sensitive and sound criticism: and this latter is expressed in so unobtrusive and good-tempered a manner, without any trace of the contemporary critical disease of trying to be arresting without necessarily advancing understanding, that the sanity and range of Professor Doran's judgement could well be overlooked.

Miss Doran's aim is 'to reconstruct some part of the context of ideas and assumptions about literary art in which Shakespeare and his fellow English dramatists, at the height of their country's Renaissance, must have worked, and to suggest ways in which these things may have helped to shape their art' (p. 3). In order to give a complete picture with every detail arranged in what appears to her the correct perspective, she necessarily has to repeat much that is to be found elsewhere. She realizes this:

Much of the ground I have traversed is already familiar through many special studies, a number of which have come out since I began my own work. . . . But to understand what I was doing and where I was going I had to work through these matters myself and state them for my own purposes. The first and last chapters of the book give the point of view, the matters dealt with, the materials drawn upon,

¹ G. Reynolds, *Nicholas Hilliard and Isaac Oliver* (Victoria and Albert Museum Handbooks) (London, 1947), p. 46.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

the procedures followed, and the conclusions reached. Anyone who reads these two can decide for himself where else in the book he wishes to look for full treatment of particular subjects. (p. ix)

While there is much to be said for this treatment of what is a real difficulty, it could be argued, nevertheless, that greater condensation would have resulted in a clearer, less unwieldy book. Yet a just verdict must admit that in practice Miss Doran has provided a work which is particularly valuable in making accessible to the non-specialist reader much information, presented competently and adequately, which is essential to a real grasp of the subject. The book disappoints only in the inconclusiveness of its last chapter: this does not come as a fulfilment of what precedes it, but rather as a survey or summary of the points dealt with.

This disappointment is trivial, however, in the face of the bounty which Miss Doran proffers in other respects. Particularly heartening is her refusal to judge critical statements made in the Renaissance until she has considered their meaning for that age, as distinct from the meaning which they have for us today. How sensible, for instance, are her remarks on the foundation for renaissance criticism provided by Plato, Aristotle, Horace, and Quintilian: 'Nor need I remind [my readers] of the greater importance for our purposes of what renaissance critics made of these classical documents than of the documents themselves' (p. 7). And again, 'of formal principles about renaissance poetry and drama' she observes that, when reading the critics, 'If we look always at their enunciated principles in the light of the applications they make of them, we get valuable indications of the really effective underlying formal possibilities by which the authors of the age were governed' (p. 12). Equally useful is the reminder that 'what looked like classicism to men of the Renaissance often does not look so to us' (p. 13). It is this attitude to the problem of appreciating the art of an age now past which makes the book valuable, irrespective of points of detail which may be disputed, such as the account given of rhetoric in the Renaissance. While most modern experts would agree with Miss Doran, there are grounds for opposing her declaration:

If an explanation other than the expressive vitality of the age and the intense cultivation of the vernacular is needed for the disproportionate attention to style at the expense of structural form, the one most easily found lies in the particular kind of rhetorical training humanistic education provided for. (p. 30)

In fact humanistic education did not direct a 'disproportionate attention to style at the expense of structural form'. If rhetoric taught Shakespeare to express *sententia* in rhyming couplets, it also taught him to place the result effectively in the developing structure of a drama.

Apart from this instance (in which, admittedly, Miss Doran would find more support than I would from modern opinion) she transplants herself admirably into the aesthetic world of the Renaissance. Insisting that we must understand fully the terms in which renaissance critics state an issue, she gives a fine exposition of their view of the relation of native talent to artistic or 'artificial' discipline. 'If someone theorizing does lean rather to the side of nature, he never does so to deny the validity of art, but only to assert the necessity of genius or of inspiration before art can be applied' (p. 59).

B. L. JOSEPH

The Tempest. Edited by FRANK KERMODE. Pp. lxxxviii + 167 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1954. 16s. net.

The New Arden *The Tempest* represents a complete revision of Luce's edition of 1901, and it is a boon to have Mr. Kermode's commentary which sets out to co-ordinate so thoroughly what has been written on the play since the beginning of the century. But informative as I found it, it gave me no pleasure. The Introduction—covering the text (its character, date, and integrity), the play's themes (including sources), its relations to pastoral tragi-comedy, the *commedia dell'arte* and the masque, its imagery and *Tempest* criticism—seemed at times murky in expression and arbitrary in terminology (e.g. the 'salvage' man). The tortuous explanation of the watch-dogs' bark seemed to me symptomatic of a general tendency to disregard what is straightforward, and Mr. Kermode's interpretation of the play made me wonder why the purpose was 'to please' and by what strange accident Shakespeare's genius found expression in drama and, most strangely, in comedy. Interpretation of Shakespeare seemed to obscure his art.

The treatment of the question of transmission in the Introduction is perfunctory, and my suspicion is growing that no one concerned with the New Arden edition has a firm grasp on the basic principle that texts should be edited in accordance with a theory of transmission that has taken into account all the stages through which it is known or surmised to have passed. This includes, in the case of *The Tempest*, (1) the proof-reading—though editors with only facsimiles to work from can only catch at straws here; (2) the compositors, identified by Willoughby in 1932; (3) the supposed (Crane?) transcript which served as Jaggard's copy; and (4) the kind of manuscript from which this transcript was made, whether foul papers or prompt-book. Until an editor has considered these questions in relation to the emendations made or proposed by earlier editors and his own estimate of the amount and kind of corruption in the text, there are no *principles* (conservative or otherwise) on which he can work.

Sometimes Mr. Kermode ventures on an injudicious alteration, as at I. i. 65 where he alters 'brown' to 'broom', impairing both style and meaning: 'long heath' (which there is no need to take in anything but the obvious sense, since a distinction between heath and heather is, in the circumstances, of no account) balances 'brown furze', and what 'long' (= 'overgrown') and 'brown' (= 'dead', since gorse is an evergreen) imply is land which is not merely uncultivated but neglected and utterly useless. At other times, he errs on the side of caution and even against his own judgement (as at I. ii. 248). Even worse, he sits on the fence in circumstances which should compel an editor to provide an intelligible reading in the text. Thus at II. i. 90, where editors usually print '*Gonzalo. Ay.*' he leaves the F reading 'I', remarking: 'I have left the F reading *I* (possibly it = "*Ay*") because, though it means nothing that I can see, I cannot better it.' But, if F's 'I' stands for the pronoun (as it should in a modernized text), the speech should be followed by a dash; and, if an editor punctuates with a period, he must interpret it (and spell it) as 'Ay'. The latter is the meaning here. Antonio and Sebastian have been gibling at Gonzalo's assurance ('his word is more than the

miraculous harp') and, having raised a city, he may do the most fantastic things with the 'I-land' they are on. Gonzalo, who has heard, says laconically (and ambiguously, since the monosyllable might have seemed a sigh) 'Ay' (= 'so I will') and, in due course, he does so when he takes up the mention of 'sowing', in the previous speech, with 'Had I plantation of this isle, my lord'; his following Commonwealth speech deliberately harps on the first person singular, and he finally admits that he has been turning the tables on the scoffers.

Mr. Kermode sits on the fence again at III. i. 15, printing 'Most busy lest, when I do it'. In spite of the ingenuity that has been spent on the line, metrical considerations suggest that it cannot be far wrong and the question to be asked is whether the sweet thoughts are most refreshing to his labours when Ferdinand is not working or when he is. If the former, then 'Most busy, least' is wanted (and this is the side of the fence on which Mr. Kermode comes down in a 15-inch note); if the latter, then the equally simple emendation to 'Most busiest,' straightens out the matter. But whatever conclusion an editor reaches, he should emend, since 'Most busy lest,' means nothing.

The text is not an easy one to edit. Past editors have been conservative—and rightly, so long as the question of transmission was obscure. What I complain of is Mr. Kermode's failure to make use of the right tools and his reluctance to recognize that scribes and compositors transposed, omitted, and interpolated words, or even that there is anything wrong with a line of seven syllables in octosyllabic couplets (IV. i. 110). Some of the cruxes are certainly obstinate—e.g. the 'scamels' and the 'broom-groves', which Mr. Kermode (agreeing with Taggart) concludes were gorse clumps, uncomfortable for the lass-lorn bachelor and neither comprehensive nor dignified enough, I think, in association with the 'rich leas', 'turfy mountains', and 'flat meads' of the Bounteous Lady. Would they provide seclusion for anything much larger than a rabbit?

The errors of the later Folios could have been omitted from the collation notes, and it would have been more helpful to users of the edition if the sigla of F2-4 had been brought into line with the Old Cambridge edition and general Arden edition practice.

The explanatory notes seem mainly serviceable and thorough, though at times over-long, owing to unnecessary indecision and beating about the bush. I liked the suggestion from Mr. Brooks about III. i. 59-63 (as I think metre is important) and Mr. Kermode's sensible interpretation of the crucial lines IV. i. 114-15 ('Spring come to you at the farthest . . .'), but II. i. 61 ff. seems to have defeated elucidation: 'nowhere in Shakespeare . . . is there anything resembling the apparent irrelevance of lines 73-97. It is possible . . . that an understanding of this passage will modify our image of the whole play.' I doubt it, and hope not, as the dialogue turns on puns. At II. i. 61, where the difficulties start, Antonio, harking back to 'vouch'd rarities' (l. 58), picks up Gonzalo's 'glosses' in the adverse sense 'deceit' and puns on 'pocket' and 'packet' (associated with humbug of all kinds, including false reports—'vouch'd rarities'). Hence Gonzalo's *packet* would manifest his deceit unless his *pocket* deceitfully concealed it. When the scoffers pick up Adrian's 'paragon', they juggle with three meanings: (1) pattern of excellence; (2) consort in marriage; and (3) comparison. Hence 'widow Dido'

is likened to Claribel in sense (1); she comes in 'by comparison' in sense (3), but ridiculously, Antonio implies, since 'widow Dido' was not a consort in sense (2). Not, of course, that the scene is mere fooling: Antonio and Sebastian are exhibited as men who, in some ways, are little better than Caliban—they will not take the print of Gonzalo's goodness; the contrasts are developed in III. iii; and the warped ingenuity of these rackers of words also acts as a foil to the excellent wit of the scenes with Stephano and Trinculo, which were presumably not juxtaposed twice by accident.

There are thirty pages of Appendixes (A. Strachey, Jourdain, and *The True Declaration*; B. Ariel as Dæmon and Fairy; C. Montaigne; D. Ovid and Golding; E. *The Tempest* on the Jacobean stage; F. The Music of *The Tempest*; G. Lineation). I found them, especially all that related to the sources, and Appendix E, interesting; G. was unenlightening, owing to lack of analysis.

I have concentrated (I hope not unfairly) on Mr. Kermodé's text and explanatory notes because, I judge, a serviceable text, accompanied by clear statements of what the words mean or what the difficulties amount to, is what the Arden edition aims at supplying and what students need. A text which leaves users to puzzle out the matter for themselves is discouraging. So far as proof-reading goes, the text seems to have been carefully edited, apart from failure to justify at II. ii. 118-19 and the omission of 'a' at the beginning of IV. i. 202.

ALICE WALKER

Christopher Cooper's English Teacher (1687). Edited by BERTIL SUNDBY. Pp. lxxvii + 10 + 122 + xxxvi (Lund Studies in English XXII). Lund: Gleerup, 1953. Kr. 24.

Cooper has hitherto been chiefly known by his *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1685), reprinted in 1911, though of recent years an increasing number of students of Modern English phonology has used his more readable though less complete *The English Teacher* (1687), which is now made generally accessible by this reprint. Mr. Sundby has worked from the Cambridge University Library copy, 'discovered' some thirty or forty years ago by the late Anna Paues, which he confesses is the only one known to him; but there is another in so obvious a place as the Bodleian, acquired by purchase in 1929. To the reprint Mr. Sundby appends a 'collation' of *The English Teacher* and the *Grammatica* (which will, however, not dispense scholars from making their own comparison), a list of misprints in the original edition (wisely left uncorrected in the text), a word-index (which would be more useful if its references to Cooper's text, as distinct from Mr. Sundby's introduction, were more complete), and the usual bibliography of works which he has himself used, some of them of no very obvious relevance to Cooper. The reprint aims at reproducing the typographical features of the original exactly (pagination, lineation, letter-forms, even such accidental features as dropped-out hyphens), and is both accurate and admirably printed. I began to make trial collations of the reprint with the Bodleian copy, but soon lost heart; the few differences I found were all mere trivialities, and probably are mostly peculiarities of the Bodleian copy lacking in the Cambridge one (e.g. a letter

dropped out in the Bodleian copy which is in the reprint, a space closed up in the reprint where a hyphen has dropped out and the Bodleian copy has a gap, the Index bound in between Parts I and II in the Bodleian copy, not after the Preface as it is in the reprint and obviously should be). If there are no graver errors than I have discovered, Mr. Sundby may well rest content with his accuracy. It should now be possible for Cooper to be more profitably studied. But Mr. Sundby perhaps over-emphasizes the usefulness of *The English Teacher* as compared to the *Grammatica*; Cooper's English style is better than his Latin, but the Latin version was the more ambitious and I have the impression that it was more carefully printed; I doubt whether the English was simply translated, with revisions, from the Latin (surely an English author would draft his book in his own language, and use his English draft as the basis for his English edition?); and the Latin text glosses the English words cited as examples, which is a help to their identification lacking in the English (though the latter gives more examples). Both versions should be used together, as Mr. Sundby himself uses them.

But the material which is prefixed to this reprint is not of the same high quality as the editing. In many ways the faults are those of a system. The courtesy of Swedish scholars in writing in English, though of great helpfulness to their readers, has its dangers for themselves; much of their philological writing has come to have a distinctive style, loose-jointed, imprecise and occasionally slangy in expression, ill-knit in argument, which too much suggests thinking on paper. And there are signs of a special jargon; thus on p. xxxix Mr. Sundby refers to an 'informant' of Ekwall's, which should imply some contemporary from whom Ekwall has derived information by personal communication, but in the context evidently means the orthoepist Jones (1701). Again the practice, in itself sound, of making a careful study of the scholarly 'literature' leads sometimes to an excessive citation of and reliance on the opinions of others even when they are unsatisfactory. The plan of Mr. Sundby's introductory material is the almost invariable one of a brief 'Introduction' followed by a long formal phonology; but it is doubtful whether this traditional plan, though it has advantages—and dangers—for those especially who wish to discover what evidence there is on a particular sound without reading extensively the original work, is always the best way of treating the evidence of an individual author, for it causes associated problems of interpretation to be split up and buries what is significant and interesting in a mass of the commonplace. Certainly Mr. Sundby, who specifically is not attempting to collect all Cooper's evidence under the formal headings but merely to treat certain points which he thinks need reconsideration in the light of the evidence of *The English Teacher*, could with profit have adopted a more flexible arrangement. Finally there are some signs of the regrettable tendency to complicate still further the conventions of philological writing; for example, the use of 'μ̄ε ā' to mean 'the reflex of ME. ā, the normal development of ME. ā' (and sounds identified therewith: thus the Present English vowel of *great*, though historically ME. ē, is in this notation also μ̄ε ā) seems to me to be of little value, hard to be precise about (I did not always see why Mr. Sundby used μ̄ε ā instead of ME. ā), and merely confusing. It can at most have saved a

few dozen words in this book (from which must be deducted those required to explain the convention). And is it really useful to write Cp. for Cooper? The dubious advantage to writer and printer must be set against the disadvantage to the reader. It is too easy to abbreviate merely because this seems the professional thing to do.

The 'Introduction', and particularly the discussion of Cooper's sources and his dialect, is perfunctory and ill-written; it shows an insufficient knowledge of the grammatical writings of the period and is imperceptive, and there is no mention here of the occurrence in Cooper of the most marked dialectalism in any major orthoepist—his use of [ea] for ME. *ā* except in *cane* and *wane*, in contrast with [e:] < ME. *ai* (including the words *age*, *manger*, &c., in which Cooper's pronunciation, despite his own belief and Mr. Sundby's, must come from the late ME. variant with *ai*). Mr. Sundby's discussion of this feature is relegated to the Phonology (pp. xxix–xxx), but he shows little realization of its exceptional nature. A curious error is in the discussion on p. xlix of the pairing of *stood* and *stud* as homophones, where Mr. Sundby shows himself not to know the dialectal pronunciation [stad] for *stood* (by early shortening of ME. *ō*), which Cooper undoubtedly used as the basis of this pairing, though elsewhere he shows later shortening to [u] in *stood*—not the only case where he varies between alternative pronunciations. In general Mr. Sundby does not know fully the history of seventeenth-century lists of homophones, nor appreciate what Cooper was doing with the accumulated traditional material (of which *stood*—*stud* is an example); in particular he does not understand the significance of Hodges's and Cooper's lists of words 'near alike' in sound, which despite their heading are lists of words that were in fact homophones, but by virtue of pronunciations which Hodges and Cooper regarded as less correct. The notes on Cooper's terminology (pp. xix–xxii) are incoherent and confusing, and fail to point out the fact that is most necessary for a reader to know, that Cooper changes his terminology from a 'scientific' to a 'popular' one between Parts I and II, so that, for example, 'e lingual long' in Part I is ME. *ai* (*ā*) but 'e long' in Part II is ME. *ē*—a shift which led Wyld falsely to conclude that Cooper identified ME. *ā* and ME. *ē*. Later, in discussing the term '*a medii soni*' (pp. xxviii–xxix), Mr. Sundby himself gets into difficulties, citing unnecessary and unhelpful parallels from other orthoepists; but the expression certainly means—what is mentioned as a bare possibility—the letter *a* when pronounced with the second of the three values which Cooper distinguishes at the beginning of Part II, Chapter II. Cooper has simply forgotten that in Part I, Ch. I, Sect. 12 he had used 'medius sonus' (so the Latin version) in a more technical way, in contrast to 'subtilis' and 'gravis'. But it is useful to have pointed out that, as Cooper reserves the circumflex for this value of the letter *a* (which is ME. *ā*), the entry *fāw* among the barbarisms must mean [fəu], the pronunciation which had earlier been the normal one of Standard English (p. xxxix).

In the Phonology the discussion, though not very well arranged, is careful and thorough but at times unnecessarily long, partly because Mr. Sundby treats more seriously than they always deserve the interpretations of Cooper's earlier

editor J. D. Jones. Yet he accepts without any discussion (p. xxxv) Jones's most dubious conclusion, that Cooper used [ɪ:] for ME. *ē*—a point of cardinal importance, for Cooper as misinterpreted by Jones is the only evidence for such a value, which is essential to the orthodox theory of the ModE. development of the sound. Similarly on p. xlii he rejects Zachrisson's view that Cooper's pronunciation of ME. *ui* after labials can only have been [ui] in favour of Jones's [oi]. The discussion of Cooper's 'u guttural' marks some advance, though it is a pity that he does not recognize quite explicitly that Cooper and other contemporary writers included [ʌ] and [ə] in a single phoneme, and why. But he follows Jones in his uncritical interpretation of Cooper's evidence on the vowel of *full*, &c., that it was [o], when in fact there can be no doubt that Cooper's vowel-system is here confused and falsified (as in the parallel case of ME. *i* and ME. *ē*). Mr. Sundby's discussion of this point, and the Kōkeritz-Whitehall view of the development of ME. *ū* which he seeks to modify, seem to me to be alike based on a false theory of how sound-changes occur; though he thinks that 'it cannot be doubted that [u] before becoming [ʌ] passed through various intermediate stages, which are still represented in ModE. dialects' (p. xlviii), it *can* be very seriously doubted—with Zachrisson (and others) I should hold that in Standard English ME. *ū* became [ʌ] by a direct change, and that the dialectal pronunciations, though developed by analogous processes and due to the same general phonetic tendency, are the results of a series of distinct and independent sound-changes. But in any case Mr. Sundby ignores the fact that the unrounding in Cooper is complete in the words in which the development is free (*cut*, &c.) and that *full* and the other words with which Cooper lists it (*wolf*, *wool*, &c.) are precisely those in which the unrounding fails; to discuss what stage of unrounding may have been reached is therefore perverse. A more reasonable explanation of Cooper's treatment of the vowel of *full*, &c., which is advanced in a somewhat unclear exposition as an alternative, is that Cooper, when he retained ME. *ū* as a rounded vowel, used a specially low dialectal variant which may be denoted as [o] rather than as [u]; but in this case we should have to assume (a) that he also used a specially low variant of ME. *i*, the parallel case (in my view), (b) that the product of later shortening of ME. *ō* in *book* and *foot* (which, despite Mr. Sundby, is evidenced before Cooper in such words) was nevertheless kept apart in his speech, as [u] or [ʊ], from rounded ME. *ū* as [o]—an improbably slight distinction, and in any case inconsistent with the fact that several of the words which Cooper ranks with *full*, &c., have not ME. *ū*, but later shortening of ME. *ō* (so *good*, *hood*, *soot*, *stood*, and in his pronunciation as here recorded, *blood* and *flood*). The very fact that the latter are distinguished from *book* and *foot* shows that there is some degree of inconsistency and confusion in Cooper's evidence, and it is therefore dangerous to seek to project back into the past, in order to explain it, what are in any event merely diaphonic variants of the ME. and ModE. [ʊ] phoneme. On p. xxxv (footnote) there is an odd example of the tendency of foreign scholars to attribute to seventeenth-century English authors a knowledge of the conclusions of modern philology; Cooper, even if he 'had some knowledge of OE' (he knew, for example, that *heaven* was in OE. spelt *heofon*), could not have had the faintest conception of the original pronunciation of OE. *ī* and *ū*, let

alone be influenced by it in his analysis of the seventeenth-century diphthongs descended from the OE. sounds, as Mr. Sundby fancifully suggests. Cooper would have pronounced even Latin *i* and *u* with the seventeenth-century diphthongs.

All in all, Cooper is much more profitable reading than Mr. Sundby; but we must be grateful to him for making generally available so excellent a reprint.

E. J. DOBSON

A Letter to Dion. By BERNARD MANDEVILLE. Edited by BONAMY DOBRÉE. Pp. x+70 (Liverpool Reprints 10). Liverpool: University Press, 1954. 6s. net.

Mandeville, the successor of Hobbes as 'Lord High Bogeyman', has an intrinsic literary importance as the deft exponent of an easy, 'low' prose, and an historical importance for his curious and probably insincere defence of a rigorist ethical position as against the sentimental school represented by Shaftesbury. He passed on the rigorist tradition to Johnson, who was impressed by his thought. Since the thorough editorial labours of F. B. Kaye in 1924, he has received scant attention, and Professor Dobrée has performed a service in reprinting his reply to Berkeley's attack on *The Fable of the Bees*. Though it lacks the insolent vigour which makes the *Fable* entertaining, this short pamphlet is important as evidence of Mandeville's anxiety to defend himself against the charge of wilfully corrupting public morals; here he points out that his *Vindication* was printed on sheets of a size enabling it to be bound up with the 1723 edition of the *Fable* (p. 7); and the inaccurate quotation from Bayle on p. 34 (a confused recollection of two passages) testifies to an obligation often present, though unacknowledged, in the scepticism and moral relativism of the larger work.

Berkeley's criticism in the Second Dialogue of *Alciphron* is perhaps not as serious or as searching as that of Law in his *Remarks*. His main argument is that vice, since it entails excess, is ultimately exhausting and therefore fails to bring the economic benefits of increased consumption which Mandeville envisaged. But Mandeville is protected here by his peculiarly comprehensive definition of vice which extends the term to any activity remotely self-regarding. Berkeley is more successful in his Socratic ridicule of Lysicles, the smart free-thinker with his cult of the 'man of pleasure'. The bustling worldly tone of the *Fable* with its would-be business-like appeal to the Sir Andrew Freeports of the day is often admirably caught (Lysicles's 'perpetual circulating and revolving of wealth and power, no matter through what or whose hands' is excellent burlesque). If Mandeville's reply is weaker in tone, it is because he prefers to remain on the defensive. Perhaps he was a little afraid of Berkeley, to whose 'polite and entertaining style' he pays a graceful compliment; but his chief defence is to fall back on a complete separation of the moral life from the sphere of practical affairs. We know the sources for this kind of argument in Mandeville's French reading, particularly the Jansenists, but whether he also owed something to English theological controversy of his own time is a question needing investigation: it is remarkable that six editions of the *Fable* came out in rapid succession in the years following the Bangorian controversy, and in this pamphlet the statement that

'the Kingdom of *Christ* is not of this World . . .' looks like a deliberate echo of Hoadly's famous sermon.

The best of the work is when Mandeville turns from rather insincere moralizing to banter directed against Berkeley's method. He spots the weak place in Berkeley's pastiche of the Socratic dialogue: his sophists are always a little too stupid for the dialectic interest to be maintained. This is brought out by parody (pp. 59-61).

Compared with that of the *Fable* the style is less racy; it seems to have become involved in the general pose of respectability; there is nothing like the description of the unscrupulous merchant as 'sure of his chap'; and though there are one or two 'low' similes, none is as good as the bowl of punch in the *Fable*. I should have liked a note on the street-cry 'Drink and be rich' (p. 37): I suspect one of Mandeville's many references to the gin traffic, and one which has escaped Mr. Paul Bunyan Anderson;¹ and there is a passage about informers (pp. 43-44) which reflects contemporary interest in the Wild case and might have been elucidated further. But the pamphlet is, as Mr. Dobrée says, largely self-explanatory, and needs no commentary other than his admirably concise introduction.

ROGER SHARROCK

The Augustan World. Life and Letters in Eighteenth-Century England.

By A. R. HUMPHREYS. Pp. x+283. London: Methuen, 1954. 16s. net.

I do not think that Professor Humphreys was very wise to stir our prejudices and rouse our suspicions before we open the book by choosing such a large title and then extending its scope further still by equating 'Augustan' with, more or less, the whole period of the eighteenth century in England. He at once, however, reassures us by explaining very frankly that his book is neither history nor sociology, and that he has no intention of competing with the experts. He is concerned only to draw a sketch of the social life of that century for the benefit of the general reader, to remove any misconceptions such a reader may have about the subject, and to help him better to understand its literature. In fact, he offers us a portfolio of six sketches, six views of 'the Augustan world'—its society, business, politics, religion, philosophy, and art, with examples added 'to show how literature was influenced'. He confesses that his task has 'proved anything but easy' and that perhaps he has not been wholly successful.

As I think it is possible that some of his readers will agree with him in this, it might be well to consider whether some of the difficulties involved in his method could have been avoided. For there is no doubt that we do need to form some conception of the world in which a writer lived and of the audience for which he wrote, if we wish to be able to read a novel or a poem with full understanding. And it is important that such general conceptions should be constantly adjusted and corrected in the light of increasing knowledge, especially at a time when so much detailed investigation is being carried out by the editors of letters and journals. I am not sure, however, whether it can be done in this way.

Mr. Humphreys has read very widely, and has gathered together a collection

¹ *P.M.L.A.*, liv (1939), 375 ff.

of excellent specimens from all sorts of documents, and has then sorted them out under his different categories to provide material for his study of each aspect of the life of the period. For instance, in his study of country life he draws upon the Descriptive Tours from Defoe to Cobbett, the comments of a great variety of foreign travellers, as well as the very varied glimpses given us by poets and novelists, without being careful to discriminate between the different value that we should surely allow to the evidence provided in this manner. And when he notices the discrepancies that occur he is content to put us off with the comforting assurance that the truth probably lies somewhere in the middle.

But the chief difficulty I find is that we are never allowed to remain at a particular point in time, where we could look round and observe what it was like to be living in London at the beginning or the middle or the end of the century, and consider the changes that had taken place. Whenever such an occasion offers we are likely to be disappointed, as for example when we are given an impression of the social round as it was noted down by Horace Walpole on 29 December 1763; but instead of any further investigation of what it was like to live in London in that very year, of which Boswell has left such vivid accounts, we are told that Walpole's comment is part of 'a pattern of social glitter', which was 'set going perhaps by Restoration comedy and Congreve, certainly by Pope'. Thus the utter difference in the political situation, and the changes that had so much altered the social pattern since the reign of Queen Anne, are entirely overlooked. That they were felt at the time is sufficiently indicated by a remark in a letter addressed to Walpole in September 1763, when Gray had asked him for news and had added: 'the present times are so little like anything I remember, that you may excuse my curiosity'.

But these are simple matters. The danger of the method is more serious when we come to the chapters on philosophy and religion, and their relation to literature. I cannot believe that it helps the reader of Blake to see him placed by the side of Watts against a background of 'the rational order of Augustan faith', even though it is indeed also admitted that Blake 'differed profoundly from current fashion', and that 'there is in him no lack of mystery'. But perhaps it is not fair to investigate further a chapter where the author admits that he felt particularly vulnerable.

HERBERT DAVIS

Alexander Pope. Minor Poems. Edited by NORMAN AULT. Completed by JOHN BUTT. Pp. xxii+492. London: Methuen; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954. 45s. net.

As originally designed the Twickenham edition of Pope's poems, under the general editorship of Professor John Butt, was to have been completed in six volumes. With the publication of Norman Ault's edition of the *Minor Poems* six volumes have already appeared, and one yet remains to come, the first of the series, for the third volume was expanded into two. Thus far the task has occupied over fifteen years. Nearly seventy years have passed since the last of the ten volumes of the Elwin-Courthope edition of Pope's letters and verses

appeared, a monumental work, but for long in need of revision and the adoption of a new and more sympathetic approach. Our gratitude is due for all that we owe to the editors of the Twickenham Pope. Beyond breadth and accuracy of scholarship we must weigh a better understanding of Pope as a poet, and a clearer knowledge of his character and of his relationship to his fellows.

When Ault died in 1950 he had been occupied for seventeen years in preparing the ground for the volume now before us. In 1935 he brought out, under the title of *Pope's Own Miscellany*, an edition of the *Poems on Several Occasions*, published by Bernard Lintot in 1717. In this collection Ault claimed for Pope between thirty and forty poems hitherto unascribed to him. Of these, it is now noticeable, over twenty are not to be found in the volume just published; or, at the best, they are relegated to an appendix of 'Poems of Doubtful Authorship'. In some instances, doubtless, Ault lost the fervour of his earlier faith. Further exclusions have been due to the more conservative view of the canon held by Professor Butt, upon whom has fallen the task of revision and final ordering of a volume which was nearing completion.

Here we have a varied garnering—among them some of the noblest poems Pope ever wrote, as for example the 'Epistle to Lord Oxford', printed as a dedication to Parnell's *Poems* of 1722. This moving tribute to

A Soul supreme, in each hard Instance try'd,
Above all Pain, all Passion, and all Pride,

has happily survived in the poet's autograph. Pope's request for permission to print the dedication and Oxford's reply are here printed in full. His perfectly-phrased acknowledgement of the honour conferred by permission granted might also have been printed. Perhaps it has been overlooked; for it was mistakenly entered by the Hist. MSS. Comm. (*Portland MSS.* v. 630) as if addressed to Lord Harley. The original is deposited in the British Museum.

On the other hand we meet in these pages with savage satires, witty turns of ridicule, unfinished fragments, notes, versicles, improprieties, and even scatological pieces. As we pursue our course the problem of the canon continually arises as a question of primary importance. The province is one which Ault so peculiarly made his own that even when doubts are excited by the argumentative attributions of his previous researches, his achievement is so impressive that the choice of an editor for this volume could never be in doubt. Patience, untiring industry, and a remarkable memory for all that Pope wrote, whether in his longer poems, including his translations of Homer, or in his shorter pieces, endowed him with a singularly felicitous gift for tracing the devious paths Pope so frequently pursued. It may be that he would have been more convincing, while marshalling parallelisms of phrase and subject, if he had been guided by a more frequent consciousness of the limitations of the evidence he employed. It would have been better also if he had sometimes called to mind Pope's amusement with those who professed to know him unfailingly by his style.

Although the value of a count by titles of minor poems previously claimed as authentic by Ault, and later discarded or removed to an appendix, can be overstated, yet it naturally induces some reflections. In *Pope's Own Miscellany*, out

of a total of over eighty poems, Ault marked thirty-eight as contributions by Pope. More than twenty of these do not appear in *Minor Poems*. Turning to *New Light on Pope*, containing what Ault described as 'new candidates for the Pope canon', we find striking omissions from the volume before us. For example, 'The Story of Arethusa', we are told, after an argument extending to seven pages, 'must henceforward be accepted in the canon of Pope's poems'. Now we find 'The Story of Arethusa' banished to the company of poems of doubtful authorship. This may be one among other examples of revision exercised by Mr. Butt, who in his introduction succinctly states the limits of security in attribution—public, private, or tacit acknowledgement by Pope himself, or the survival of corrected holographs. In Pope's instance the word 'corrected' should be noted and stressed. A helpful guide is afforded to the reader by marking with an asterisk in the table of contents those poems which satisfy one or another of these tests. It is worth noting that, excluding the appendix, more than half the poems contained in this volume pass the test of secure attribution to Pope.

Some passing notes may here be added where so much is to be said and space forbids a complete commentary. In his *Prose Works of Alexander Pope* (1936) Ault attributed to the poet a sixteen-page pamphlet, *The Critical Specimen* (1711). Dennis had published an unmerciful review of the *Essay on Criticism*. Ault contended that *The Critical Specimen* was Pope's rejoinder, basing his claim upon parallels between this piece and *The Narrative of Dr. Robert Norris* (1713), a lampoon on Dennis. As Professor Sherburn concluded, however, 'there is no sufficient evidence' of Pope's authorship of *The Critical Specimen*, a contention upheld long since by the present reviewer (*R.E.S.*, xiii (1937), 490). If the prose pamphlet is more than unlikely to be by Pope the two verse pieces it contains, printed here under the titles of 'A Simile' and 'A Rhapsody', p. 79, seem to fall with it.

A doubt must be entertained whether Pope played any part in the composition of the 'Prologue, Design'd for Mr. Durfy's last Play', p. 101, which was first printed in Steele's *Poetical Miscellanies*, 1714, and there stated to have been 'Written by several Hands'. Professor Rae Blanchard in her edition of *The Occasional Verse of Richard Steele* (1952) makes out a strong case for the belief that 'tradition and custom to the contrary, it should be placed with Steele's writings'. Ault never saw the case stated for Steele, but Mr. Butt inserts a note calling attention to Miss Blanchard's discussion of the authorship.

Surely the 'Inscription upon a Punch-Bowl', which has no authentication beyond Thomas Birch's transcript and his word for it, should be moved to the doubtfuls? Even Ault admits that 'the epigram must remain an attributed piece'.

The couplet addressed to George II,

O All-Accomplish'd Caesar! on thy Shelf
Is room for all Pope's Works, and Pope himself,

is here taken, together with the answering quatrain, p. 392, from a contemporary transcript among the Portland Papers at Longleat. Ault was unaware that the couplet, in Pope's autograph, is to be found mounted in a scrap-book of Mrs. Charles Caesar of Benington, with the answering quatrain written in her

own hand. See *Catalogue of the Rothschild Library*, No. 564. Of the quatrain Mrs. Caesar noted, 'Mr Pope came in person with thanks'.

Of singular interest is Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's autograph of 'The Universal Prayer', preserved among the Harrowby manuscripts and hitherto unrecorded. It must most nearly represent the text as it was originally written in 1715. The earliest printing was in 1738.

On p. 423, among the doubtful attributions, we are referred to another poem among the Harrowby manuscripts, verses addressed to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu transcribed in her own hand—the well-known lines beginning 'In Beauty or Wit'. When the poem was printed by Anthony Hammond in his *New Miscellany*, 1720, it was stated to be 'By Mr. Pope', and this attribution was readily repeated. The editor of *Minor Poems*, in accepting Lady Mary's attribution to 'Judge Burnet', has overlooked, however, more important evidence to the same purpose. The poem is printed on pp. 164–5 of Professor Nichol Smith's edition of *Letters of Thomas Burnet to George Duckett*, 1914, and is introduced with these words: 'To enliven our almost deceased Correspondence, I will send you a Copy of Verses that came very lately from my Parnassus; they are in imitation of Sir John Suckling's easy gentile way, and made upon a Lady that is famous for reading.' The letter is dated 'Feb. 5th 1719'. This is conclusive evidence of authorship. Burnet even says that he was imitating Suckling. A copy of the poem reached Lady Mary. She transcribed it with the title 'On a Ladys Learning. By Judge Burnet'. This transcript must have been made many years after the composition of the poem, for not till October 1741 was Burnet appointed to a judgeship of the Common Pleas. The poem appeared, with slight alterations, in Burnet's posthumous collection of *Verses* published in 1777.

If these brief notes appear to address themselves to critical doubts they should be understood as no more than observations on incidental parts of a work which must command respect for the labour and care expended on historical, bibliographical, and textual aspects of Pope's shorter poems. The poet's regard for perfection, even when engaged upon no more than a few lines, is here notably borne in upon the reader. Further, he will be conscious of Pope's care for the exact word when he studies the textual apparatus demanded in the exposition of poems like 'The Court Ballad' and 'Verses on a Grotto'. The editor's arrangement of his material, it should be added, where dates of composition are frequently in doubt, is most helpful. The poems are grouped within ten-year periods. The prominent entries on the page of the titles of major poems, in their proper chronological positions, serve as indicative signs of the placing of minor verses in their relationship to Pope's greater works. HAROLD WILLIAMS

The Percy Letters. The Correspondence of Thomas Percy & David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes. Edited by A. F. FALCONER. Pp. xxvi+186. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. \$4; 30s. net.

When an ancient folio manuscript, 'unbound and sadly torn', containing poems, songs, and metrical romances, came into Bishop Percy's possession, he

decided, with the encouragement of Dr. Samuel Johnson and William Shenstone, to make its contents known. Such was the immediate occasion of the publication of the famous *Reliques* in 1765. As Mr. Falconer points out, the manuscript furnished little more than a quarter of the *Reliques*, and Percy was indebted to his friends for most of his material. Not the least important contributions were 'The beautiful Scottish poems' mentioned by Percy in his Preface as having been supplied 'with many curious and elegant remarks' by the Scottish judge, Sir David Dalrymple, Bt., whose forensic title was Lord Hailes. Hailes, well known to readers of Boswell as one of Dr. Johnson's correspondents on literary and historical matters, had edited the ballad 'Edom o' Gordon' for the Foulis press in Glasgow (1755), and was to make many contributions to the revived interest in Scottish history and vernacular literature.

The extent of his contributions to the *Reliques* is now disclosed in detail for the first time in this volume of correspondence. The letters of Hailes were lost in 1780 in a fire in Northumberland House, where Percy was residing as chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland. At Percy's request his letters to Hailes were returned to him by Lady Hailes, who retained copies of them. The originals are now in the British Museum; but Mr. Falconer should have noted that through the kindness of Sir Mark Dalrymple, the present baronet, microfilms of the copies, still at Newhailes, have been deposited in the National Library of Scotland. Some of them appear to have been corrected by Percy. Mr. Falconer has omitted a postscript in Percy's hand to the letter of 10 November 1762. The editing, however, has been carefully done, and the notes display a scholarly knowledge of the bibliography of the subject.

The help that Hailes gave to Percy is thus summarized by Mr. Falconer:

He brought many ballads to Percy's notice. He searched for the best oral versions or the best printed texts that were to be had. He supplied notes and historical information which Percy speaks of as having added 'great merit to my book'. Moreover, after Shenstone's death in 1763, Percy tended to consult Hailes on more general matters connected with the publication of the *Reliques*.

The treatment of defective or corrupt texts by editors has been a fertile subject of controversy since Percy's day, and the correspondence throws interesting light on his methods. Thus he wrote to Hailes about the ballads printed by the Foulis press:

You will pardon me if I suspect that they received some beauties in passing through your hands. This was not only an allowable freedom (if they did) but absolutely necessary to render them worth attention. You will hence infer that I take the same liberties myself; I do when it seems wanting, and in that case I mention it in my introduction, without any scruple; and where the original reading contains anything peculiar I retain it in the margin.

Hailes had a reputation for accuracy. He expressed himself as dissatisfied with Allan Ramsay's *Evergreen*, a miscellany taken from the Bannatyne manuscript in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, now the National Library of Scotland. He intended to bring out a new and corrected edition, but eventually edited his own

selection, entitled *Ancient Scottish Poems Published from the MS. of George Bannatyne, MDLXVIII*. Unfortunately for his reputation as an editor, the copy he sent to Percy is in the Harvard University Library, collated and annotated in Percy's hand. Mr. Falconer discusses this interesting copy in Appendix II. Percy's notes show that Hailes was sadly to seek as an accurate editor of early Scottish vernacular poetry.

It may be added that Mr. Falconer's volume is the fourth in the series of *Percy Letters* under the general editorship of Professor D. Nichol Smith and Professor Cleanth Brooks, and that two of the other studies, the *Percy-Farmer* (1946) and the *Percy-Warton* correspondence (1951), contain letters showing Percy repaying his debt to Hailes by obtaining for him sources for one of his historical works.

HENRY W. MEIKLE

The Works of Jane Austen. Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. Vol. VI. *Minor Works*. Pp. x+474. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 21s. net.

It is too late in the day to praise the *Oxford Illustrated Jane Austen*, that acknowledged monument of scholarship and taste, but one can congratulate Dr. Chapman on completing over a generation's service to the novelist by the addition to it of her *Minor Works*. Here are the same scrupulous editing, the same brief and pithy annotation, the same elegant choice of illustrations that we are accustomed to. The *Minor Works* include the three volumes of the *Juvenilia*; *Lady Susan*; the fragments of *The Watsons* and *Sanditon* (a note tells us that family tradition preserves Jane Austen's intended title, *The Brothers*, which may help to abate the importance that critics have attached to locality in this book); and a miscellany of short pieces ranging from charades to prayers. The earliest date that can be established is the conclusion of *Love and Freindship* on Sunday 13 June 1790, when the authoress was fourteen and a half; the latest is 17 July 1817, the day before her death, when she composed the comic verses on Winchester races. One strong trait links the first and the last of these pieces, the joyous delight in absurdity. It is as marked in *Sanditon*, in the incongruous energies of the valetudinarian Miss Parker and the gluttonous placidity of her brother, as in *Jack and Alice*, and it is both surprising and comforting to find the bubbling stream of fun running from the pen of an ailing woman with only a few more weeks to live. There is nothing quite so exuberant since those sprightly gargoyles, Mr. Collins and Lady Catherine de Bourgh, and it seems likely that, had she lived to complete and polish *Sanditon*, the boisterousness would have been refined and the ridicule rationed. How much, one wonders, of Mrs. Norris, Mr. Woodhouse, and Sir Walter Elliot had been excised in the interests of realism and harmony? The slight difference between the planes on which Mr. Collins and Mr. Bennet move has no parallel in the later books; yet it does not seem that this was because her relish for extravagance faded. She retained the love of clowning, but reduced the clown in her under the control of the artist's and moralist's conscience; and there was certainly meat for the moralist in the Parker family.

The clown of the *Juvenilia* was already a critic, and to detect all her critical strokes requires not only an acquaintance with the respectable Miss Burney and Mrs. Radcliffe but also a sampling of the amorphous and anonymous products of the contemporary novel-market. The initial accumulation of characters who are never put into action, the collapses and huddled ends of the stories are not marks of immaturity in the writer but mimicry of others. When Charles Adams in *Jack and Alice* declares, 'I expect nothing more in my wife than my wife will find in me—Perfection. These Sir, are my sentiments & I honour myself for having such', he demonstrates both the scruples of the typical romantic hero and the onus of self-praise laid on him by the epistolary novel. Elsewhere burlesque gives way to discipleship, and in *A Collection of Letters* there is an exercise in the exposure of a young girl to the callous vulgarities of a moneyed patroness that is quite in the Burney vein. These things were on Jane Austen's path; we hear the first strident syllables of the speech of Lucy Steele, Lydia Bennet, and Mrs. Elton, and in *Catherine or the Bower* we meet the first Austen heroine. But a speculative interest attaches also to the experiments that proved to be not on her path, notably *Lady Susan*. How serious was this effort to depict a cold and bad coquette, and when was it undertaken? It handles the same sort of common-stock material as Colonel Brandon's narrative, with the same careful sobriety, until it stops (rather than finishes) with the author's good-humoured laugh at the failure of her narrative method. She did not, it appears, occupy instinctively the position indicated in the well-known words from *Mansfield Park*, 'Let other pens dwell on guilt and misery. I quit such odious subjects as soon as I can.' Imagination or experience must at times have suggested to her a wider field, which growing self-knowledge declined. Yet Mrs. Clay is an ugly and credible sketch in the middle distance of *Persuasion*; and what was she going to make of the Byronic Sir Edward Denham?

It is with such questions in mind that one turns to *The Watsons* and to Cassandra Austen's account to her nieces of the intended course of the story, recorded in the second edition of the Austen-Leigh *Memoir*. 'Much of the interest of the tale was to arise from Lady Osborne's love for Mr. Howard and his counter-affection for Emma.' Dr. Chapman thinks there is confusion here and that it was the daughter, Miss Osborne, who was to love the young clergyman. Is he right? Lady Osborne's age, 'nearly fifty', cannot be considered conclusive, and when the Osborne party enters the ballroom it is to her that our eyes are directed and not to her daughter. She is, we are told, 'very handsome', with 'all the Dignity of Rank'. The eighteenth-century novel had not neglected the emotions of ageing women, and it is not unlikely that Jane Austen could have seen such a match in the mixed society of Bath and, in those uneasy, urban years of her life, have contemplated it as a subject. If so, failure of confidence in her choice may have had something to do with the dropping of the book.

These are tenuous possibilities, it must be admitted; but in unfinished work it is often the abortive and unfamiliar that is illuminating. A little too much has been made of the narrowness of Jane Austen's scope, and illegitimate deductions have been drawn from that to the narrowness of her interests. All art is a selection of experience, and perfection in art requires the relinquishment of the

unmanageable interest, which nevertheless indirectly enriches the masterpiece. *Lady Susan*, and perhaps *The Watsons*, suggest that this was also Jane Austen's case.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

Wordsworth—A Re-interpretation. By F. W. BATESON. Pp. x+227. London: Longmans, Green, 1954. 21s. net.

This book is noteworthy for its sturdy efforts against the bardolatry of Wordsworthians, and for its determined attempt to show Wordsworth as a man who may be understood, as 'a man speaking to men' and not as an idol to be approached through the *disciplina arcani* of which Pater wrote. It draws heavily on the material which de Selincourt and Miss Darbishire have made available over the past thirty years, and it is also rich in nineteenth-century anecdotes and recollections which are too often neglected. The portrait which emerges of poet and man ('the two are indissoluble', says Mr. Bateson) will not satisfy all readers; but Mr. Bateson's purpose remains valuable.

Mr. Bateson believes that a peculiarly Wordsworthian problem, epitomized in 'Wordsworth's change in poetic manner in the summer of 1798' (pp. 38-39), can be approached best (indeed only) from the biographical side. To this approach he is led by his characterization of the 'two voices' of J. K. Stephen's parody: to the nineteenth century they were 'bad' or 'good', but our generation can, and should, hear them rather as the voices of two poetic modes: 'earlier' and 'later' in Wordsworth's development; 'eighteenth-century' and 'nineteenth-century'; 'Augustan'¹ and 'Romantic'; 'objective' and 'subjective' (pp. 8-14). The best poems harmonize these voices, achieving a Coleridgean reconciliation of opposites. In others, the poetic modes jar. The problems raised by such confusions of purpose can best be solved, in Mr. Bateson's view, by close attention to 'Wordsworth's own state of mind when he wrote his poems' (p. 39). The bulk of the book is concerned to define Wordsworth's successive states of mind and the kind of poetry they produced.

The states of mind are seen as a recurrent pattern of emotional crisis (associated with Wordsworth's 'subjectivism' and, in certain early verse, with an addiction to 'Gothic' imagery) followed by relief. The crises arose from Wordsworth's unhappy childhood; from his jilting, about 1786, of a certain Mary of Esthwaite, conjured from some early poems first printed in 1940; from French affairs, political and personal, in 1792-3; and from the discovery in 1798 that he was falling in love with his sister. Symptoms of crisis are seen in incidents such as those of the stolen boat and the wait for the horses (*Prelude*, I and XI [xii]); the Gothicism of *The Vale of Esthwaite*; the Gothicism of *Salisbury Plain*; and the turn towards subjective and memorial poetry after the summer of 1798. Symptoms of inter-

¹ This term is unfortunate when applied, as Mr. Bateson applies it, to the 1798 *Ballads*. Wordsworth thought he was writing 'new' poetry in 1798; he was not wholly correct, but he was not writing in the tradition of Pope. Elsewhere, Mr. Bateson links *An Evening Walk* (which Wordsworth in 1801 distinguished from *Lyrical Ballads*) with 'the decadent twilight of the Augustan tradition' (p. 74), and points out that typical 1798 *Ballads* 'are written in a deliberate defiance of' literary tradition (p. 200).

vening periods of relief are seen in the objectivity of *An Evening Walk*, and in Wordsworth's attempt to identify himself with social outcasts which continues from the revised *Salisbury Plain*, through *The Ruined Cottage*, and into the 1798 *Ballads*; the final phase of subjectivism is partly an escape into the self, partly an attempt to impose order on all past experience which culminates in *The Prelude*. 'The rest', says Mr. Bateson, 'should have been silence' (p. 169).

Wordsworth found a thousand objects standing between the biographer and the image of things; and for this patterning of the man's experience, as Mr. Bateson admits, 'the evidence . . . is always inadequate and sometimes non-existent. I have often had to guess' (p. 40). Where basic facts are not in doubt, the guesses are convincing. That Wordsworth was on the political and moral Left in the early 90's is certain; it is possible that this is to be connected with childhood repression, probable that Wordsworth felt himself wronged by the upper classes personified by Lord Lonsdale, certain that he had a grudge against the government for its attitude to France. Whatever the reason, we know the fact, and we can agree that, in the ensuing years, Wordsworth 'was profoundly sorry for the world's failures . . . because . . . he had known the bitter humiliation of social failure himself. . . . In a sense he *was* Margaret. But the shame, the rancour and the frustration had to be outgrown and lived down before he could look back on his own past calmly and dispassionately' (p. 128). Elsewhere, the evidence is pressed too hard. Mary of Esthwaite, despite de Selincourt, was probably not Mary Hutchinson, as Mr. Bateson shows (pp. 65-66); but it does not seem to follow that, because she was not one real person, she was necessarily another. It is probable that Dorothy Wordsworth's feeling for her brother exceeded that degree of affection usually recognized as sisterly; but that Wordsworth returned such an affection, or was even very acutely aware of his sister's case, does not seem to be proved or capable of proof. Mr. Bateson's guess that the stay with the Hutchinsons in 1799 was made to prepare for 'the desperate remedy of marrying Mary Hutchinson' (p. 156) can be matched by another: that the Wordsworths went to Sockburn because they had no home after losing Alfoxden the previous summer. 'We are yet quite undetermined where we shall reside', wrote Dorothy in July 1799, 'we have no house in view at present.'¹ And was not Wordsworth, in terms of Mr. Bateson's thesis, courting disaster by living alone with his sister for the next two years?

The shift from the more or less objective *Ballads* of 1798 towards the subjective mode of later work, heralded by 'Tintern Abbey', remains obvious and in need of explanation. Mr. Bateson provides the materials for another guess: that in Goslar Wordsworth lacked the 'poetic stimulus from the everyday events of the real world' which he had had at Alfoxden (p. 150), and that he fell back upon himself and his memories in order to write poetry. Indeed, he may have considered the vein of the *Ballads* worked out in 1798; he had rejected other modes earlier, perhaps for no profounder reason.

As Mr. Bateson sometimes ignores the alternative guess in biography, he

¹ *Early Letters* (Oxford, 1935), p. 228. De Selincourt in his *Dorothy Wordsworth* (Oxford, 1933) claims that, on Wordsworth's return from Germany, 'his one desire . . . was to see Mary' (p. 106); but he cites no evidence, and I can find none.

neglects also relevant material in Wordsworth's prose. From the Preface to *The Borderers* to the *Essay on Epitaphs*, the prose provides, if not an explanation of the changes in poetic mode, then a running commentary on them. The stress in the Preface to *The Borderers* on Oswald's rejection of common moral norms, as well as indicating that Wordsworth was 'no longer . . . a revolutionary' (p. 123), anticipates a similar emphasis in the Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*. The 1800 text of that Preface shows Wordsworth concerned with the moral implications of poetry nearly two years before his letter to Wilson of June 1802; the concern is enlarged in the Preface of 1802, and the *Essay on Epitaphs* reaches the conclusion that a bad man will be likely to produce bad poetry. The 1802 Preface describes that sympathetic identification of poet with characters (an eighteenth-century commonplace) which Mr. Bateson finds exemplified in Wordsworth's treatment of his social outcasts. More significant, Wordsworth's stress, lacking in the 1800 Preface, on the importance of this psychological manœuvre, which enables the poet to write dramatic poetry while yet giving vent to 'the spontaneous overflow of [his own] powerful feelings', is symptomatic of a new outlook in 1802: towards the poetic which Professor M. H. Abrams has recently taught us to call 'expressive' and which is congruous with the marked increase in subjectivity detected by Mr. Bateson in the later *Ballads*. Elsewhere, the Preface seems to argue against Mr. Bateson. The 'thesis of . . . intermittent inspiration' which he cites (pp. 9 ff.), only to reject it, from Arnold's Preface, is perhaps illustrated by Wordsworth's concession, in the later part of the 1800 Preface, of possible failures in choice of language and subject; and the 1802 text concedes that dramatic invention may fail because sympathetic identification cannot be maintained. We need hardly doubt Wordsworth's concern 'to illustrate a psychological principle' (p. 37; cf. pp. 26 ff.) in various poems, when the 1800 note to 'The Thorn' informs us that 'Poetry . . . is the history or science of feelings'. Of these matters Mr. Bateson says too little.

Two references on p. 194 to the '1815 Preface' should be to the '1815 Essay'. There are misprints on pp. 136 and 143.

W. J. B. OWEN

John Keats: The Living Year. By ROBERT GITTINGS. Pp. xvi+248. London: Heinemann, 1954. 16s. net.

The 'living year' begins with the beginning of *Hyperion*, on 21 September 1818, and ends with *The Fall of Hyperion. A Dream*—a dream broken on 21 September 1819. Throughout this year Keats's works, Mr. Gittings tells us, are 'a poetic diary of his daily life'. But we have more than one diary to reckon with. Besides the poetic diary of his daily personal life, there is, from 17 September on, 'the true pocket-book or diary of his literary life' (p. 52). This true pocket-book is Burton's *Anatomy*. In the first of several interesting and valuable Appendixes to his book Mr. Gittings tables all (and more than all) the 'Parallels between Burton's *Anatomy* and Keats's poems and letters'. Mr. Gittings has been ever so industrious and ingenious about it. But does he, perhaps, make too much of a good thing?

¹ *The Mirror and the Lamp* (New York, 1953), *passim*.

The poetic diary is, in any case, more exciting than the true diary. I wish I felt sure that all the exciting things which Mr. Gittings transcribes from it really happened—that the poetic diary was a true pocket-book. Professor Hyder Rollins, who knows more about Keats than any of us, and is never taken in by anything, has no doubt (nor have I) that Mr. Gittings's 'original, brilliant, stimulating study . . . throws a flood of new light on Keats and his poems'. I like all that, and I like Mr. Rollins for letting it stand as blurb on the fly-leaf of Mr. Gittings's book. But when Mr. Rollins gets to particulars, I am less happy. 'In particular', he writes, 'Mrs. Isabella Jones' (whom he speaks of, oddly, as 'heretofore a dark horse') 'and the material about her and *Hush Hush, tread softly, Bright Star* and *The Eve of St Agnes* is fascinating. She will henceforth practically rival Fanny Brawne.' Really, I am not sure whether all this helps the book or merely helps to sell it. It is nice to know that Mrs. Jones really existed—if only because Miss Lowell thought there was no such person. But if the first version of *Bright Star* was addressed to her, then she not only rivalled Fanny Brawne, she fooled her. Fanny Brawne copied the poem into Keats's pocket Dante. Did she do that knowing that it was written for Mrs. Jones? And do gentlemen—or poets—pass on to the new love the tendernesses they devised for the old and cast-off one? Brown, whose transcript of the sonnet survives, and who was the first person to print it (in 1838), dates it, in his manuscript, 1819. That does not tell us when Keats wrote it; it merely tells us, Mr. Gittings thinks, when Brown copied it out. It was written, Mr. Gittings believes, 'as early as the last week in October 1818 . . . before [Keats] had met Fanny Brawne'. We discover that, or Mr. Gittings does, by comparing the first eight lines of the poem with a sentence from one of Keats's letters. In Letter 71 (written to Tom Keats in June 1818) Keats, speaking of Lake Windermere, tells his brother that the two views he has had of it 'are of the most noble tenderness—they can never fade away; they make one forget the divisions of life; age, youth, poverty and riches; and refine one's sensual vision into a sort of north star which can never cease to be open lidded and stedfast over the wonders of the great Power'. This steadfast north star Mr. Gittings finds ever so informing. 'It can only be', he says, 'while [Keats] had this passage before his eyes that he wrote the first eight lines of the sonnet.' He had the letter before his eyes, we know from another letter (94), on 31 October 1818. On that day he sent it to George Keats in America. He can only have written the sonnet, Mr. Gittings thinks, when he had the letter actually before him—'the likeness is so close that there can be no question of memory'. It is all very ingenious. But to be frank, I find none of it convincing. Could it occur to Keats only once in a lifetime to think of the north star as 'stedfast' and 'open-lidded'?—he had thought of 'the lidless eyes' of planets (*End.* i. 198-9) as early as 1817. Yet for a date for *Bright Star* earlier than Brown's 1819 this is all the evidence that there is. There is just nothing, in fact, to connect Mrs. Jones with *Bright Star*. Nor with all the goodwill in the world can I find anything that connects her with *Hush, hush, tread softly*, unless it be the circumstance that the poem is addressed to 'sweet Isobel' (Mrs. Jones bore the name Isabella). This poem also—of which the theme is an illicit love-affair between the poet and his Isobel—Keats showed to Fanny Brawne. Fanny

Brawne knew the very day on which it was written—nobody else knew, not even Brown. It was a notable day; 21 January 1819, St. Agnes' Day. Keats's *Eve of St Agnes* was written, we know from a note of Woodhouse, 'at the suggestion of Mrs. Jones'. She knew what she was after. She had met Keats, Mr. Gittings tells us (but I can discover no authority for it), on 20 January, St. Agnes' Eve, 1819. Not only had she met him, Mr. Gittings thinks it likely that she had slept with him. From that came, the very next day, *Hush, hush* (though the love that it celebrates is an earlier episode, of summer time). Thereafter Keats settled down to *The Eve of St Agnes*. Some amatory passages in it his publishers did not much like—they felt them to be 'improper'. But for Keats 'this side of the story was a real experience'. It brought back to him 20 January. Mr. Gittings is not quite certain about it all. But 'it is at least possible', he says.

If I don't like any of this, it is because I am afraid of what will come of it. Mr. Gittings's book is so good and so clever that everybody will believe what he tells them. All the books about Keats will, before long, be all about Mrs. Jones. For me Mr. Gittings begins to be at his best when he gets Keats away from Mrs. Jones. More interesting than Mrs. Jones and Hastings are Mrs. Lacy (chaste and seventy) and Chichester. Mrs. Jones, and in a less degree Fanny Brawne, 'combine', Mr. Gittings tells us, 'in the sensuous love-atmosphere of' *The Eve of St Agnes*. It may be so (but I don't believe it). What Mr. Gittings does bring home to us is the manner in which the beauty of medieval Chichester informs large tracts of the poem. Chichester and Stanstead—to each of them Mr. Gittings devotes a valuable chapter. The illustrations showing the crypt and pulpitum of Chichester and the east windows of Stanstead Chapel are admirable. And everywhere this attractive book is embellished by first-rate illustrations.

H. W. GARROD

Walter Savage Landor. A Biography. By R. H. SUPER. Pp. xv+654. New York: University Press, 1954. \$7.50.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives us two definitions of biography: 1. The history of lives of individual men, as a branch of literature. 2. A written record of the life of an individual. It must regretfully be recorded that Mr. Super's book comes in the second category, which is a little disappointing seeing that in his monograph on the publication of Landor's works he made something approaching a work of art, or at least of interpretation. Yet if this is just a written record, one can at least say 'How admirably, how fully, how conscientiously it is done!', which, considering the length and complexity of Landor's life, is perhaps all one could hope for. It will be for a very long time indeed the quarry from which future biographers will hew the stones from which to create their works of art. As it stands this is a great advance upon all previous biographies of Landor. Forster's is very incomplete, and no longer stimulates the creative imagination; Mr. Malcolm Elwin's *Savage Landor*, to which Mr. Super pays a handsome tribute, lacks a good deal of the information Mr. Super has patiently collected, and besides being a little too romanticized (the very title gives, or gives away, its ethos too readily) divagates too much on minuscular personages.

Mr. Minchin's agreeable little work, useful as far as it goes, deals only with the 'last days'.

The difficulty is that Landor's life was so crowded with incident, none of which in a sense is minor, that the biographer honestly concerned to give all the facts has relentlessly to pile one on the top of another; and even so, Mr. Super has had to relegate to a hundred pages or so of notes a great deal of background information which in a life of less scope might have given body to the actions of the subject. For a man with ordinary energy, to have written the amount that Landor did would have been enough, but besides that, he strove with (nearly) all, though none was worth his strife. It began with the publishers of his early Latin verses, went on through the tiresome affairs of Llanthony, the further worries about publishing, the behaviour of certain people in Florence, the abominable activities of the Yescombes at the end of his life, to name only a few. Landor was always passionately extreme, in his loves, his hatreds, his political notions, his family affections, his personal relations with men. It is a marvel that a man so violent in many ways could also be so exquisitely tender. He paid for it abundantly: if he loathed darkness, he often made it blacker than it really was; if he loved light, he was often deceived by a candle into thinking that it was dawn, and sometimes mistook phosphorescence for a gleam of true sunlight. His carelessness about material things was often irresponsibility. Yet from it all there emerges such a magnificently leonine figure, as both Swinburne and Browning saw, that everything can be forgiven him—supposing even that the superb quality of his work was not enough.

All this comes out in, or can be extracted from, Mr. Super's book, which, incidentally, is beautifully arranged, with an excellent bibliography and a more than competent index, or rather indexes. Any incident or person can easily be picked out. It cannot, however, be pretended that this is a readable book; against this Mr. Super might reasonably ask, 'How could it be?' It is not a book one can sit down and read. Not that Mr. Super is, as Bagehot once said of someone, 'a learned and illegible writer'; learned he certainly is, but his writing is admirably lucid, clear of jargon, and well balanced: but fact after fact has to come out, and these take up all the room. How should it be otherwise, with the enormous amount of material, buttressed by indefatigable research, that had to be brought into the picture to make it complete? For in the end, when one has brought oneself at various times to allow Mr. Super to take one through the intricate maze, the picture does emerge complete; all the more so because Mr. Super hardly ever allows himself to judge. But we have to make our own picture, paint our own portrait, and we have very little given us to help us mix the colours. A good deal of verse is here and there quoted in illustration, but not the best, and hardly any of the prose which many think constitutes Landor's chief claim to glory, as well as giving us the most probing insight into what the man was really, essentially, like. But anybody likely to read so long and compact a volume as this will be familiar with much of Landor's work—nobody but an editor would be familiar with all of it—so the loss will not be there. The pity is that this volume is not likely to lead anybody to read Landor, all the more because it is a thoroughly scholarly work, the impulse to do which can have been provided only by an

admiration for the literary qualities in the work of this too neglected writer. It cannot be said that Landor will ever dine at all; there will be some admirable collations where the table will be, not well lighted, but only by carefully directed candles, though here too the guests will be few and select. Mr. Super will be among them.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

John Ruskin. By JOAN EVANS. Pp. 447. London: Cape, 1954. 25s. net.

Dr. Evans's Introduction gives as her reasons for writing another life of Ruskin the inadequacy of the existing lives, her access to his unpublished diaries (which, edited by her and Mr. J. Howard Whitehouse, will be published by the Clarendon Press in 1956), and her own Victorian background which she describes. After briefly characterizing the *Lives* by Cook, Collingwood, Wilenski, Leon, Quennell, and others, she uses them as sources, and does not explicitly contradict or correct them except on the dates of three letters. Wilenski's book 'remains fundamental . . . but it may bear expansion on the biographical side. Moreover . . . it may be well to quote rather more freely' from Ruskin's works, as people nowadays read them so little. Much of her rather annalistic book—the chapter-headings are sometimes misleading, only parts of chapters 8, 9, 12, and 13 deal with the subjects they announce, and chapters 17 and 19 do not exhaust theirs—is taken up with these extracts and her comments. Sometimes a comment seems called for where none is made; e.g. Ruskin's statement to Kathleen Olander about Effie (p. 405) is hard to reconcile with Effie's desire for children (p. 157) and study of Sismondi and Raphael (p. 144).

Dr. Evans's claim for the diaries that 'nowhere else can the spontaneity alike of his own sensibility and of his literary style be more acutely realized; nowhere else can his true originality of mind be better assessed' cannot be decided till they are published, but if this merely means his word-painting is sincere, that was never in doubt. Many extracts from the diaries were published in the Library edition (vol. xxxviii gives a chronological list). There are also his letters. And the non-autobiographical parts of Ruskin's work are all too often concealed autobiography. Dr. Evans does not claim that the diaries establish any important new conclusion. The 'occasional want of feeling—the "but I felt nothing" that comes as a refrain in the diaries' (p. 412) was already known from the letters (e.g. *Memorials of Burne-Jones* (London, 1904), ii. 16).

Inevitably Dr. Evans's approach involves covering again much familiar ground. Ruskin's inability to look at a building structurally, his desire to 'eat up' Verona, his characterizing Rossetti's Nativity as 'worsted work' (and Rossetti's calling him 'half-informed'), his letter about 'gin and bitters under pseudo-Venetian capitals', his new preface to *The Stones of Venice* about the 'dark and slippery arrangements' of parish churches, his fairness to Millais after their estrangement, his failure to notice contemporary French painting, and his dislike of sparks, and Millais's gift of his *St. Agnes* to Effie, and the Turner-Whistler 'paint-throwing' echo have all been noticed by Wilenski, Sir Kenneth Clark, Admiral James, or William Gaunt. The sources of the *Bible of Amiens* are given by Ruskin himself.

There are some minor omissions and errors. 'Henderson and Gillespie' re-

ferred to on pp. 49 and 380 is their *Textbook of Psychiatry* (London, 1940); 'C. du Bos 401' (p. 411) is his *Journal 1921-1923* (Paris, 1946), p. 392; 'Pope-Hennessy' (p. 148) is Una Pope-Hennessy, *Kingsley* (London, 1948). None of these books is named in Dr. Evans's Bibliography or anywhere else. The letter to George Macdonald quoted on p. 263 is dated 8 February 1864 and not to the winter of 1860-1 as the context implies. There are many mistakes in the quotations on p. 241.

Dr. Evans is not an enthusiastic admirer of Ruskin. Such phrases as 'a strangely childish bargain', 'a rather absurd plan', 'a turgid state of mind' are common. Her final judgement of him (p. 422) as 'one of the finest minds of its generation' comes as a surprise. And there are other questionable verdicts in her 'Conclusion': that 'critics fail to recognize . . . that his feelings were not roused by the emotions of a mature man' (p. 413) is not true of Quennell; that it is possible to admire different painters (p. 416) is no defence of Ruskin, who contradicted himself and thought it a virtue to do so; the debt of our classless society to *Unto This Last* (p. 419) would be hard to distinguish from its debt to others such as Rousseau, Bentham, and Christ.

It remains extraordinary that a man who never achieved a satisfactory human relationship, an art critic who did not introduce a single new painter to the public, and a critic of architecture who did not approve of a single building erected in his lifetime should have attracted so much attention. Ruskin was influential because his public was uncritical. This gives him a place in the history of taste, but does not justify the interest in his life.

C. H. SALTER

William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival. By ROBERT SPEAIGHT. Pp. 304. London: Heinemann, for The Society for Theatre Research, 1954. 21s. net.

This is, of course, the first full-length study of Poel's life, work, and influence, though he died some twenty years ago. We owe to the Society for Theatre Research the idea of commemorating the centenary of Poel's birth by the *matinée* at the Old Vic and by this volume, which counts as the Annual Publication of the Society for 1951-2. It contains a great deal of new material. Mr. Speaight has had the unrestricted use of Poel's papers, including a diary of the years of his beginnings on the stage. He has built on the work of Mr. Allan Gomme, whose valuable chronological list of Poel's theatrical activities, and short bibliography, are printed as appendixes. Sir Barry Jackson invited a number of those who had worked with Poel to put their impressions on record for the Memorial Theatre library at Stratford; from this collection Mr. Speaight prints generous extracts. He enjoys the advantage of having himself worked with Poel, and of a backstage knowledge of the theatre in which Poel's influence has been at work, a theatre which rarely expresses its artistic aims in manifestoes for the scholar to study. He presents such a wealth of information that one feels ungrateful in expressing a wish for more details of Poel's settings. It is not to be expected that a man of the theatre should be equally at home in the world of scholarship; but, for the sake of accuracy, one must point out that Mr. Speaight's accounts of the early

history of certain of the plays produced by Poel are occasionally incorrect or misleading. Moreover, there are places where one would appreciate additional references.

Perhaps all good biographers have something of the actor in them; certainly Mr. Speaight is notably successful in his portrayal of Poel, depicting his gentleness and uncompromising idealism with reverence, but not without humour. He sees Poel as a religious artist without a church or an artistic tradition: 'His mind craved for a message which would match his own intuitions of reality; a message quite free from the formulas of the Christian creed' (p. 168).

He shows how Poel's puritan and radical views led him to alter texts. One is tempted to derive other features of Poel's work from his character; at least it is difficult not to side with those who believe that Poel was less a theatre historian employing the experimental method than a creative director finding inspiration in traditions of the past.

Poel's methods have often been summarized, and much of the new material provides additional evidence for the received view. But we must change some of our ideas. It emerges that Poel's practice was more varied than is generally believed. On occasion he employed a multiple setting. For *The Duchess of Malfi* he employed the scenery of his day, feeling 'that the plot was too incoherent for pure Elizabethan treatment' (p. 73). His *Troilus and Cressida* was elaborately lit. In his last years the foundation of the Elizabethan Stage Circle gave him the opportunity of working on a stage which had almost the full Elizabethan intimacy. It has been pointed out from time to time that Poel should not be regarded as an apostle of the integrity of the text; but the error is persistent, and Mr. Speaight sets himself to demolish it once for all. Poel went back to the original text, it is true; but he did not consider what he found there to be sacrosanct. *Love's Constance*, which Poel made out of *Edward III*, is a faithful reproduction of a section of the source; on the other hand he could cut and rearrange very boldly, and not just on moral grounds, but to improve the dramatic construction. At his most extreme he cut lines in Shakespeare's best vein to get a straightforward action. This taste in part explains his interest in the First Quarto of *Hamlet* and *Der Bestrafte Brüdermord*. Mr. Speaight also deals with some neglected aspects of Poel's work: the 'unerring rhythm' of his productions; his sense of stage effect; his power of conveying a character to the actor; and the famous 'tones', which Poel thought the most important part of his teaching, as Sir Lewis Casson has told us (*The Listener*, xlvii (1952), 57). In view of this importance attached by Poel to the musical speaking of verse, it is to be deplored that he was apparently never recorded.

The book is well illustrated, though one might suggest an additional illustration to show the rear of the reconstructed Fortune stage. Any impression that Poel's productions were drab is likely to be dispelled.

Mr. Speaight shows that much of what we today take for granted began with Poel; moreover, time and again we find in his pages that Poel is still ahead of us. His book is not only an historical study; it is bound to renew Poel's influence, and advance what Mr. Speaight has called 'the Elizabethan Revival'.

J. F. ARNOTT

Fair Greece, Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron. By TERENCE SPENCER. Pp. xii+312. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1954. 25s. net.

George Finlay expressed the opinion that the philhellenism of which Byron is the great example was the growth of the new series of ideas disseminated by the French Revolution. The connexion of the modern Greeks 'with the old pagan Hellenes was repudiated by themselves and forgotten by other nations'. Mr. Spencer in this agreeable book proves that Finlay was wrong. By numerous examples and quotations he shows that the identification of the Christian Greeks with the pagan Hellenes began long before the days of Byron. It was even already expressed in the sixteenth century, circulated freely in the seventeenth century, and even more freely in the eighteenth.

The author shows this clearly in his survey of the literary contacts between England and Greece during those centuries, and no one who reads this book can doubt that Greece herself and her people together with her ancient monuments and her literature received, long before the French Revolution, full attention from the 'erudite, the literary, and the sentimental'.

The mass of material collected and sifted by Mr. Spencer is astonishing, and what he has selected from travellers and poets is most illuminating. His running commentary is judicious and easy to read and he introduces or reintroduces to us most pleasantly many forgotten or ill-remembered personalities, such as Falconer or Polwhele, the now dim immediate predecessors of Byron. Other characters who figure prominently in his pages are travelling scholars like Fynes Moryson or the ill-fated Tweddell, Lithgow the pugnacious Protestant, the learned Wheler, Levant Company agents, and ambassadors (for Elgin had many forerunners) and chaplains at Constantinople.

He opens with a chapter on the 'Disappearance of Greece' from the regard of western Europe after the fall of the last fragment of the Byzantine Empire in 1453. He calls attention to the suggestion then current that made the Turks descendants of the Trojans. Not only Rome, but other countries like Britain claimed to be the offspring of Trojan refugees, and the Turks had avenged Troy! The Battle of Lepanto (1571), which called forth a poem from James I and VI, reminded Christian Europe of its dangers from the Mohammedan Turks. Although Ferdinand and Isabella had finally freed Spain from the Moors, the Turks more than a century later were still battling at the gates of Vienna. It was the European devotion to Hellenic studies and the realization of the Turkish danger to Christian Europe which were the decisive factors in promoting philhellenism. Further, those adventurous travellers who reached Greek lands fell under the irresistible spell which the Greek landscape has always cast.

The author rightly emphasizes the fact that those who have written best or most sympathetically about Greece and her many aspects have always been those who have been there. Such were Robert Wood, the originator of the 'Homeric Question', and Byron himself. Oddly enough, one of the most successful books about Athens in the seventeenth century was a fraud, de Guillet's *Athènes ancienne et nouvelle*, which was published in an English translation in London in

1676 and had several editions. In spite of its fraudulent character the book is in its way important, for it was readable, based on good sources, systematic, and the first of its kind.

A most interesting chapter is that called 'Graecia Sacra' and deals with the attention devoted by seventeenth-century England to the Orthodox Church. The Protestant divines of England, notably two Archbishops of Canterbury, Abbot and Laud, were naturally interested in the Patriarchate and the Eastern Church as a counterweight to the influence of the Papacy in Europe. One of the great men who appear here is Cyril Lucaris, to whom the British Museum owes the Codex Alexandrinus. This he had taken with him from the Patriarchal Library in Alexandria on his translation to Constantinople. Thence he sent it by the ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, as a present to Charles I.

Remarkable too are the suggestions made by Waller that Charles II or James II should imitate Sobieski and lead crusades against the Turks and liberate Greece so that new Homers and new Pindars could arise and celebrate their glories and virtues.

That there are so many points in this interesting book that call for reference or reflection shows that the author has undoubtedly succeeded in his purpose. Johnson's tragedy *Irene*, Canning's *Slavery of Greece*, and the sudden turn of chance which diverted Coleridge from visiting Greece occur at once as subjects for comment. If Byron's visits to Greece had so much influence on his poetical genius, what influence might not Greece have had on the sensitive Coleridge! He at least would not have been a damp squib like Charles Kelsall or William Haygarth. Finally, we expect that the author's remarks will encourage his readers to unearth in a library *Woman or Ida of Athens* published by Miss Sydney Owenson in 1809—but enough. This is a pleasant, instructive, and most sympathetic book which all 'Grecians' should read.

A. J. B. WACE

Transitions in American Literary History. Edited by HARRY HAYDEN CLARK. Pp. xi+479. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1954. 45s. net.

For the second time in twenty-five years American scholars have successfully produced an interpretation of their literary history which is more than a catalogue of names or a list of influences and cross-references. It begins with 'The Decline of Puritanism' by Clarence H. Faust which forms a broad-based introduction to the whole and helps to explain forces at work until the 1870's. Professor Faust reveals the precarious equilibrium which Jonathan Edwards imposed on Calvinistic theology, and briefly shows how the centrifugal forces of a developing subcontinental society could be influenced by its founding faith but not contained within it. Unfortunately the literature of this early period receives little attention.

'The Late Eighteenth Century: An Age of Contradiction' by Leon Howard also has no literary figure (except Philip Freneau) to present to us, but Professor Howard's treatment of a difficult subject illuminates much that follows. Con-

scious of conflicting 'neo-classical' and 'romantic' forces, he carefully suggests lines of approach which may clarify this obscure period in American literary history. Fundamental ideas in philosophy, religion, politics, and aesthetics are presented with subtle clarity and substantiated without jargon or tendentious generalizations.

'The Decline of Neo-classicism, 1801-1848' by M. F. Heiser and 'The Rise of Romanticism, 1805-1855' by G. Harrison Orians discuss the same period from different standpoints without much repetition. Professor Heiser describes the domination of Pope and the English 'nature' poets, the tardy growth of Wordsworth's reputation, and that combined influence of Scott, Byron, Carlyle, and the German idealists which helped to change literary ideals and practice. In discussing native writers like Poe, Cooper, Irving, and Bryant, he successfully explains the indifference of Americans to European romantic attitudes of revolt. His analysis of movements of thought relies on sweeping generalizations, but his final conclusion is just: that, despite the neo-classical 'hang-over', geography and an expansionist society helped to create the concept of the 'epic of America' which itself was a 'heroic-romantic idea'. Professor Orians is less convincing: he includes too much and his study resolves itself into bitty sections. Though his private concern with the tremendous influence of Scott leads to an admirable treatment of his work, this interest dominates his vision too exclusively. This section of his study suffers least from over-reliance on critical jargon and on the explanation of minor literary phenomena in terms of sweeping general forces.

In contrast, 'The Rise of Transcendentalism, 1815-1860' by Alexander Kern starts with some advantages: with Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne, and Melville the English reader is on familiar ground and the American writer is supported by a wealth of previous study. But it is ungracious to play down Professor Kern's contribution; he possesses a recognizably personal style proceeding from mastery of his material, and he confidently accepts repetition in order to attain clarity. With deceptive ease he discusses the period in terms of intelligible ideas and problems which are still vital to us. His subject-matter is the first coherent body of American literature, and he communicates a personal experience of it by using single significant examples to support views which neither force the evidence nor explain away inherent contradictions.

In proportion to the rest of the book, 'The Decline of Romantic Idealism, 1855-1871' by Floyd Stovall seems too big a subject for such treatment. The writer rarely overcomes this hazard. He tends to resort to summary generalizations, although his vision of 'the frontier', the aftermath of the Civil War, and the impact of Darwinism as the three principal causes of decline is quite clear. To Whitman, Mark Twain, and Bret Harte he is a true guide, but the fourth section (on sentimentalism and sensationalism) reads like a catalogue, and his account of the first decade of the *Atlantic Monthly* lacks critical grasp. Professor Stovall writes well on Eggleston, but I should have liked more discussion of the poetry of Emily Dickinson and Sidney Lanier. The final study, 'The Rise of Realism, 1871-1891' by Robert Falk, offers more profitable material. Howells, Henry James, Bret Harte, Mark Twain, and Lanier give backbone to the discussion of 'realism' and the growing social consciousness of the 1880's, and, except in his

analyses of popular literary criticism, Professor Falk is master of his subject and his style. Significant quotations are appositely used and the handling of spiritual, social, and intellectual problems shows a keenly perceptive mind at work as he traces James's development as a writer, Howells's editorial mission, George Eliot's powerful example, or the seminal influence of the localism of the West. As he ends his study one feels that the whole book has been incorporated into it and thereby given unity of purpose.

For this coherence the general editor must be praised: he has given space where most research or reinterpretation is needed. We in this country should take note of his belief that the further clarification of such American studies would be assisted by reviewing once more our own cherished opinions about the change from neo-classical to romantic modes of writing. The overlapping method used here—derived from the widespread American use of symposia—is obviously rewarding and this admirable example of its value could profitably stimulate a cisatlantic revival in the study of literary history.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry. By W. K. WIMSATT, JR. Pp. xviii+300. Louisville, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1954. \$4.00.

In the autumn *Kenyon Review* (1954) Mr. John Crowe Ransom observed, 'Mr. Wimsatt is of reasonable temper, and he has read everything', thus indicating two of this book's merits—its promotion of discussion, and its catholicity of reference. It is a collection of critical essays with an underlying theme, presented with a tough-minded originality which takes no doctrine on trust. The theme is the 'iconicity' of poems, and the development of critical procedures for examining it. 'Iconicity' is that quality by which, besides their dictionary-references or denotations, words mean their meanings by enacting them—by which their interrelationships of sound, texture, logico-grammatical structure, and rhetorical coherences (homoeoteleuton, rhyme, puns, chiasma, zeugma, and so on) contribute symbolically to what they 'mean'. 'The verbal icon' is 'a verbal sign which somehow shares the properties of, or resembles, the objects which it denotes' (p. x).

Professor Wimsatt tries to establish a poem as a 'verbal structure' to be analysed within the limits of its own terms, unembarrassed by questions of whether the poet achieved his aims ('the intentional fallacy') or of what the reader's experience is like ('the affective fallacy'). A healthily provocative discussion of these 'fallacies' opens the book which, however, also contains much of value in subsequent essays. This initial *parti pris*, of course, pushes against a vast weight of tradition. 'In every work regard the writer's end' is almost a critical cliché, and a knowledge of intentions seems to most authors (as Mr. Wimsatt recognizes on p. 29) relevant to judgement on their work, and to most readers desirable as an aid to the critical 'taking' of the text. Mr. Wimsatt is a robust and searching thinker, and objections one may think of bringing against his positions he generally proves to have propounded himself already. One may

feel, for example, that his stress on the poem *in ipso* ignores what scholarship can provide. Yet, of course, this has not escaped Mr. Wimsatt; his chapter on 'History and Criticism' is precisely relevant and states the relationship between the poles of its title admirably. In short, he may seem to be narrow, but he is not: he is merely firmly disciplined in excluding irrelevance. No one educated on *Practical Criticism* will much want to oppose him here, though one may feel a reservation or two: the point is that while a critic may usefully be aware of intentions, or historical circumstances, external evidence must be supported by reasons in the work itself why it is so and not otherwise.

The parallel inquiry into the 'affective fallacy' counters the practice (from Longinus to Dr. Richards) of relating the standards of criticism to a poem's psychological effects. The tricky question of what, if one rejects this 'fallacy', one means by calling a poem good or bad, Mr. Wimsatt answers in a not very easy essay called 'Explication as Criticism', in terms not of psychological effects but of technical and intellectual adequacy, applying to the judgement of poetry the contention that 'values are continuous with and embodied in experience, in the facts and the structure of the facts' (p. 246). This is healthy and realistic critical doctrine.

It is insufficient, however, to concentrate on this initial *credo* to the exclusion of everything else. Even if here, or when dissecting the Chicago critics, Mr. Wimsatt were wrong, he would still elsewhere prove himself an alert practical critic. He is indeed best in actual comment on poems and prose-passages, evincing an acute mind able to improve the quality of literary reading quite apart from the validity of his theories. And many of his essays (such as 'Verbal Style', 'The Substantive Level', 'One Relation of Rhyme to Reason', 'When is Variation "Elegant"?', and 'History and Criticism') make precious clearings in the jungle of rhetoric and semantics from which others may start explorations. The essays are not, perhaps, clear enough as wholes, but each contains profitable *aperçus*, and one can imagine them, if read at conferences, provoking fruitful discussion and much further thought.

The stimulus Mr. Wimsatt provides is, however, reduced by a style much less crisp than it might be. Examining one of his terms Mr. John Crowe Ransom commented, "'The Concrete Universal"; is this the language for a critic?' Mr. Wimsatt can be clear and terse; he recommends himself by a shrewd American wit; and his idiom (like that of some kindred books) is more formidable on first reading than on a second or third. Some reviewers have been too hard on him in this respect. Still, one has some cause to smile wryly on meeting his own 'strong preliminary complaint against the frequent opaqueness' of a rival critic's style, for 'opaque' is often the apt word for his own. Technical terms like that Mr. Ransom queries are, if ugly, not without utility, though one hopes not to meet them too often in criticism. But a phrase like 'a quasi-pluralistic theory regarding various historically recoverable systems' is repellent, and so is this: 'the means-end situation of style and content becomes, in the dramatic focus, itself a terminal fact of structure'. Some passages, like the last paragraph on p. 27, seem after repeated re-readings incomprehensible. The fault may be the reviewer's ('either his notion weakens, his discernings are lethargied'), but it is

human nature on a reviewer's part to think not: he comes on this, in the essay on 'Verbal Style':

The word *verbal* as it appears in the title of this essay looks in two directions or has two antitheses. In combination with the word *style* it designates a level of meaning distinct from the substantial, and especially from the stated part of substantial meaning. At the same time, *verbal* implies that the level of stylistic meaning is something different from what is expressed by the medium of any other art, and that the discussion will avoid such metaphors as 'verbal painting' and 'verbal music'—or if it employs them briefly, will do so in full overtness.

Having worried at this for some time he decides that it means:

I use *verbal* in my title because I propose to deal with words, which as a medium of expression differ from the media of other arts; and I use *style* for qualities other than the 'substantial' meaning.

And he is confirmed in his view that Mr. Wimsatt, a hard worker himself, often works his reader much too hard. Must this be the style of so much intelligent American scholarship?

To end on that note would not be right. It is a real source of trouble that the writing of this book can be, though often it is not, so turgid. Yet the acumen and persistence of inquiry are admirable, and if one wants to think hard about criticism this is a book to read.

A. R. HUMPHREYS

SHORT NOTICES

Alt- und Mittelenglische Anthologie. Edited by ROLF KAISER. Pp. xxxii+474. Berlin: privately printed, 1954. DM. 6.90; cloth boards DM. 7.80.

This very substantial book, containing a wide range of specimens of Old and Middle English writings, is the product of a German scholar's enthusiasm for his subject. Its modest price, less than half the printing costs, and meant to make it accessible to students, reflects the personal sacrifice of the editor, who undertook the publication himself. Such sincere devotion to Early English scholarship commands admiration. One accepts, then, as necessary limitations of the enterprise, a small type-face and a crowded page. The merit of the book is that it puts into students' hands what otherwise they would not buy.

More than 200 Old and Middle English works are represented, the main exceptions being, for obvious reasons, *Beowulf* and the poetry of Chaucer. The length of excerpts varies according to the importance and interest of the works, but selections are designed to be characteristic of the texts that they represent. The contents are arranged to encourage historical and literary comparison. A formal division into Old and Middle English is not emphasized, although a rough chronological order is generally maintained. Introductions to individual texts are not provided; these are left, the editor tells us, to the teachers who will use the book in their classes. Some bibliographical references are, however, given. The source of the text and its principal editions are named, and photographic reproductions have been used to ensure accuracy. Emendation is restrained except in the case of texts designed for beginners; similarly, signs of vowel quantity appear only in these texts, though capitals and punctuation are modernized throughout.

A second volume is promised, to contain grammatical aids, sources, variant readings, notes, further bibliographical material, and a glossary. This will make more generally

useful a book which at present can be of service only in the special circumstances for which it was designed.

Teachers in this country are unlikely to use Dr. Kaiser's anthology, which in its present form cannot hope to supplant the now almost traditional Old and Middle English readers generally prescribed here. Dr. Kaiser's book is an emergency measure, and a brave one, which deserves success in the purpose for which it was undertaken. GEORGE KANE

Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400. By BEATRICE DAW BROWN, ELEANOR K. HENINGHAM, and FRANCIS LEE UTLEY. Pp. 169. New Haven: Yale University Press for the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1952. \$4.00.

The devoted and unselfish labours of J. E. Wells are here carried on by three scholars in a record of the work done in Middle English studies between December 1941 and December 1945. These scholars have earned the satisfaction of knowing that, like Wells himself, they have given invaluable aid to their fellow-students of Middle English everywhere. What is striking in this *Supplement* is the fullness of the authors' reports on the conclusions reached in many of the studies under review: a notable example is Mrs. Loomis's important article 'The Auchinleck MS. and a possible London bookshop of 1330-1340' (*P.M.L.A.*, lvii (1942), 595-627), the account of which fills more than a page (pp. 1781-3). In these summaries in the text the authors have kept strictly to reporting, in accordance with Wells's procedure; the exclusion of critical judgements, if regrettable, is inevitable in a work of this kind, and is on the whole probably the best policy. A minor matter of convention that catches the eye is the occasional intrusion of references to women scholars by their surnames alone, as on pp. 1801 (item 157) and 1806 (199 [7]): it is to be hoped that this practice will not be generally adopted. We regret to learn from the preface that there is not likely to be a *Tenth Supplement*. G. V. SMITHERS

Barnaby Rich. By THOMAS M. CRANFILL and DOROTHY HART BRUCE. Pp. x+135. Austin: University of Texas Press; Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1953. 10s. 6d. net.

Mr. Cranfill and Mrs. Bruce have pooled the result of almost twenty years' research to produce this attractive little book. One's first thought is: would that every two academic dissertations were thus given to the public in one small volume. But this is unjust to the much lengthier studies of other 'minor Elizabethans', such as Prouty's *George Gascoigne* and Izard's *George Whetstone*, which, as well as dealing with the lives of their subjects, include full discussions of the works. As the sub-title proclaims, *Barnaby Rich* is 'A Short Biography', and, apart from a few particulars in the first introductory chapter, the twenty-six works are only referred to briefly or in so far as they contain autobiographical material. Mr. Cranfill has, however, published articles on Rich's works which show that he is well qualified to produce a fuller study. It is to be hoped that he will take an early opportunity to clear up the canon of Rich's works (e.g. on p. 5 editions of *Riche His Farewell* for 1581, 1583, 1594, and 1606 are cited, whereas *S.T.C.* only gives those of 1581 and 1606); as is noted in the first chapter, so many of them turned up later under new titles, and sometimes as the work of other authors. Such a statement as 'Books continued to pour from his pen—in 1606, 1609, 1610, 1612, 1613, 1614, 1616, 1617—and readers in 1609, 1612, and 1613 were gladdened by two works in each of those years' (p. 119) is meagre nourishment for the eager bibliographer.

But let us be grateful for what we have: a coherent account of Rich's long life in some detail from the siege of Newhaven in 1563 until, about a year before his death, a warrant

was issued in 1616 'to pay to Barnaby Rich the eldest Captain of the Kingdom, 100*l.* as a free gift' (p. 126). Twenty years of Rich's life were spent in Ireland, and his long and unsuccessful struggle to expose the corruption of Archbishop Loftus and other highly-placed individuals is ably pieced together from Rich's own writings, Hinton's *Ireland*, and the *Calendar of State Papers—Ireland*. Three letters preserved in the Chester town archives provide a hitherto unknown episode; and, in addition to the State Papers and the Acts of the Privy Council, recourse has been made to those fertile sources for Elizabethan biography, the records of Chancery Proceedings and of the Court of Requests. The authors manage to make a lucid and interesting narrative out of this somewhat rebarbative material. Rich's impecuniosity often made him importunate, and perhaps also accounted for his frequent involvement in litigation; one may also suspect that he was on occasion infuriating in his self-righteousness. But the character of this forthright soldier, this brave opponent of corruption in high places, both in his actions and also with his pen, emerges more clearly than those of many of his more eminent contemporaries. J.R.

The Stage Business in Shakespeare's Plays: a Postscript. By A. C. SPRAGUE.

Pp. viii+29 (Society for Theatre Research Pamphlet Series 3). London: for the Society, 1954.

Mr. Sprague is rare among Shakespearian scholars in having devoted his skill and energy to recording the traditional means of pointing the author's meaning by stage action. The present pamphlet, published by the Society for Theatre Research (one of whose functions is to make information of this kind generally available), is a collection of notes from old prompt books, newspaper files, correspondence, and eyewitness accounts compiled during and after the publication of his book *Shakespeare and the Actors*. Its brevity is no criterion of its usefulness.

The breakdown in traditional methods of training actors which has come about in both America and England during this century and the lack of organized National Theatres make it urgent that matters hitherto handed down orally or visually from father to son or actor-manager to boy apprentice be entrusted to print. This is the more important in that good actors who wish to interpret a play to an audience often arrive more surely at the true understanding of a line from guidance in 'how to do it' than from 'being told about it'.

Actors, however, are by no means the only likely beneficiaries. Critics can find in these comments on *Hamlet*, or *Macbeth*, *As You Like It*, or *Henry VIII* standards of more weight than personal opinion by which to judge performances. It is salutary, too, for audiences to realize that their predecessors knew their Shakespeare in performance well enough to recognize departures from convention. Dubliners of 1821, for instance, rebuked Sir Andrew Aguecheek for making his exit after the fight by climbing up the scenery 'as if furnished with the claws of a cat'. For producers, Mr. Sprague's comments on the handling of crowd scenes are particularly revealing. He is always careful to differentiate imaginative business 'within . . . the scope of the author's intention' from that which extends beyond it. Nor does he overlook contemporary invention. Mr. Quayle's Falstaff of 1951, for example, is cited here. In the Tavern Scene of 2 *Henry IV*, II. iv, Doll started to hurl crockery at Pistol. 'Whereupon Falstaff, fearful that his precious jug of sack might follow, quietly moved it out of harm's way.' Although this pamphlet is only available to members of the Society, its merit makes one hope that they will be generous in lending their copies to a wider public. GLYNNE WICKHAM

The Harmonious Vision: Studies in Milton's Poetry. By DON CAMERON

ALLEN. Pp. xx+125. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 24*s.* net.

The author is so disarmingly modest in his Preface that it may be ungenerous to confess to not having found much nourishment in this collection of essays. The best seems to me

the most straightforward, that on 'Despair and Samson Agonistes'; elsewhere the book is too often tortuous without giving the impression that its difficulties are justified by what the author has to say. Phrases such as 'we are also made aware of the tissue of vision by a process of absolute dimension' (p. xvii) convey nothing to me, and 'they will be refined and implicative to the degree that they will have a more intimating and a more organic containment' (p. 6) very little more. And is the desirability of training ourselves to think in Renaissance categories an adequate excuse for such clotted jargon as 'This *contaminatio* of pagan and Christian topoi in the mode of the paramythia' (p. 47)? Renaissance learning, indeed, which Professor Allen possesses in ample measure, is seldom brought effectively to bear on critical problems, and a certain modish anti-modernity tends to irritate: 'Modern man is his own world, for which he makes light by the generators of his inward darkness' (p. 95). Among minor eccentricities is a love of Greco-Latin hybrids, not only 'homocentric', but also (in an obscurely metaphorical sense) 'isolateral', and 'aurophile'. The printing of Greek is a disgrace to a University Press, and there are some nasty lapses in Latin: *Lumen divina* and *concors discors*. On p. xviii, 'Belial' is a slip for 'Mammon'. This is not my sort of book; but even apart from personal tastes, I cannot believe it is calculated to advance the understanding of Milton.

J. C. MAXWELL

Robert Brownings dramatisches Experiment. By WALTER FEDERLE. Pp. 128. Pfäffikon-Zürich: Schellenberg, 1954. No price given.

Dr. Federle singles out Browning's dramatic efforts from the rest of his work and accounts plausibly both for their specific features and their episodic character. The discussion is based on Browning's 'Essay on Shelley', which contains in outline his conception of literary art. The poet, according to Browning, is faced with the ceaseless rhythm of the universe which calls forth two different attitudes, the subjective and the objective, in the creative artist. Whereas the objective poet immerses himself completely into the cosmos, the subjective one remains inquiring and analytically-minded. As God is the source of this dualism two different forces, love and power, rule the world. They are the respective ideals to which the two types adhere. In the face of this all truth becomes relative, as the inner being is the decisive factor in the make-up of the individual. The poet naturally predestined for dramatic art is the one who sees things objectively.

The second part of Dr. Federle's study consists in applying Browning's own theories to his dramatic work. In his plays Browning depicts both subjective and objective characters whose dramatic conflicts arise out of the irremediable discrepancy between reality and aspiration towards the ideal. Death, therefore, not only means reconciliation between the two opposed forces, but also self-realization of the protagonist, who finally resists the lure of reality and sacrifices himself for the self-chosen ideal. Although clear in its exposition this chapter falls short of the first one, the various aspects of which should have been more fully applied.

The third part deals exhaustively with Browning's dramatic technique and gives a good insight into the inner workings of the poet's mind. It also explains why Browning abandoned drama. The general shift in stage conventions from a theatrical to a more naturalistic style, which took place at the time, was not favourable to Browning's plays. Furthermore, the constant quarrels with Macready, who staged his plays, resulted in Browning's disillusionment, and finally there was a change going on within himself. From the time he met Elizabeth Barrett he became more and more a subjective poet himself, and this made him, in his own opinion, unsuited to drama.

This study is coherent in itself and convincing, although laboured in style. The summaries at the end of each section are very helpful. Since critical literature on Browning's drama is scanty this contribution will be welcome to the Browning specialist.

W. ISER

Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXXVIII, 1952. Pp. xiv+362.
London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954. 55s. net.

This volume includes the Warton Lecture by C. S. Lewis on *Hero and Leander*, the Shakespeare Lecture by Allardyce Nicoll on Co-operation in Shakespearian Scholarship, and the Gollancz Memorial Lecture by Gwyn Jones on Egill Skallagrimsson in England. The obituary tribute to Benedetto Croce is unfortunately too brief to do more than merely remind readers of the philosopher's contribution to English studies.

Of *Hero and Leander* 'my main concern', says Professor Lewis, 'is not to assess the absolute merit of either [part] but to suggest the propriety of reading the composite poem as a whole'. His appreciation of the remarkable contrast in outlook and style of Marlowe and Chapman adds a strong inducement to the suggestion.

Professor Nicoll's main plea is for what may be called a collegiate recension of Shakespeare's text. Many hands contributed to the *O.E.D.* and many more will be needed in the preparation of an Elizabethan dictionary. Why, he asks, should not an attempt be made to produce 'a kind of Authorized Shakespeare'? The textual problems are now so many and the labour they demand so extensive that only from a group of scholars working in close collaboration can we hope to get, Professor Nicoll argues, an edition that will be generally acceptable.

Professor Jones gives a clear and vivid summary of Egill's exploits at Brunanburh and York. It is especially interesting to see, in the few specimens quoted, how Icelandic is translated by so skilful a writer of novels and stories. The prose, if sometimes a little mannered ('the chin wondrous broad'), moves beautifully and is full of vigour; and the verse, which seeks to give the effect of the sound-patterns as well as the meaning of the originals, succeeds perhaps better than any earlier rendering—for all the strangeness of its forms to English—in reading like a new composition. These brief extracts will arouse keen interest in the forthcoming publication of the whole of this distinguished translation.

P. A.
N. D.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

ANGLIA

Band 73, Heft 2, 1955

Metrical variation in *Beowulf* (Eva K. Touster), pp. 115-26.

'Piers Plowman' im Lichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie und Theologie (Willi Erzgräber), pp. 127-48.
James Shirley and sentimental comedy (Robert R. Reed, Jr.), pp. 149-70.

Miltons Entwürfe zu einem Drama vom Sündenfall (Maria Wickert), pp. 171-206.

Zur Aufnahme deutscher Literaturwerke in England (Herbert Koziol), pp. 207-12.

The third source of Dryden's *Amphi-*

tryon (Margaret Kober Merzbach), pp. 213-14.
Zu Byrons Hebrew Melodies (W. Morel), p. 215.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xxxviii, No. 1, September 1955

Carlyle's letters (Charles Richard Sanders), pp. 199-224.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxvi, No. 5, October 1955

Another lost manuscript of the *O.E. Orosius*? (Fernand Mossé), pp. 199-203.

The legal maxim in Ælfric's homilies (Karl Jost), pp. 204-5.

The terms 'Subjunctive' and 'Indicative' (F. Th. Visser), pp. 205-8.

Hips. A contribution to the 'she' puzzle (Eugen Dieth), pp. 209-17. Expanded verbal forms in early Modern English (Karl Brunner), pp. 218-21.

'The Noble Savage' until Shakespeare (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 222-7. Remarks on Shaw's history plays (H. Lüdeke), pp. 239-46.

The influence and poetic development of W. B. Yeats (Max Wildi), pp. 246-53.

Between literary criticism and semantics (Heinrich Straumann), pp. 254-62.

Time, tense, and aspect in Modern English (B. M. Charleston), pp. 263-78.

A note on Bloomfield's limiting adjectives (Henri Frei), pp. 278-81.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. v, No. 4, October 1955

A medieval poem and its secularized derivative (Francis Berry), pp. 299-314.

Clarissa Harlowe and her times (Christopher Hill), pp. 315-40.

A prelude to *The Prelude* (Edwin Morgan), pp. 341-53.

Art and *The Portrait of the Artist* (Jane Jack), pp. 354-64.

The new and the newer critics (John Holloway), pp. 365-81.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

VIII^e Année, No. 3, juillet-septembre 1955

Un inédit de Raleigh sur la conduite de la guerre (1596-1597) (Pierre Lefranc), pp. 193-211.

Charles Dickens and his wife (K. J. Fielding), pp. 212-22.

La signification historique, diplomatique et littéraire de la *Lettre adressée à l'Abbé Raynal* de Thomas Paine (Alfred Owen Aldridge), pp. 223-32.

HISTORY

Vol. xxxix, No. 137, October 1954

The Anglo-Saxon writ (G. Barraclough), pp. 193-215.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Vol. liv, No. 2, April 1955

Beowulf and the liturgy (Allen Cabaniss), pp. 195-201.

Spenser's Cuddie: Edward Dyer (Paul E. McLane), pp. 230-40.

Two notes on Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* (Charles Elliott), pp. 241-54.

Ludwig Tieck and Coleridge (Earl Leslie Griggs), pp. 262-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xvi, No. 3, September 1955

The predicament of Gawain (George J. Engelhardt), pp. 218-25.

The temptations in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (Martin T. Williams), pp. 226-31.

On the identity motive in *Paradise Regained* (Edward Cleveland), pp. 232-6.

The development of Pope's *Iliad* preface. A study of the manuscript (Douglas Knight), pp. 237-46.

The multitudinous orb. Some Miltonic elements in Shelley (Ants Oras), pp. 247-57.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. I, No. 4, October 1955

Walter Hilton and 'The Cloud of Unknowing' (Phyllis Hodgson), pp. 395-406.

Richard Robinson and the Stationers' Register (W. W. Greg), pp. 407-13.

'Beowulf' 219: 'ymb an tid' (R. W. Burchfield), pp. 485-7.

Notes on glosses to Lindisfarne Gospels (Betty Hill), pp. 487-8.

Chaucer's shipman and his cargo (Mortimer J. Donovan), pp. 489-90.

A source for 'The Healing of Sir

Urry' in the 'Morte Darthur' (P. E. Tucker), pp. 490-2.

An 'inconsistency' in '3 Henry VI' (Andrew S. Cairncross), pp. 492-4.

'A Midsummer Night's Dream', v. i. 4-17 (Wm. A. Nitze), pp. 495-7.

Two notes on Thomas Heywood (Arthur Brown), pp. 497-8.

Wordsworth and Colthouse near Hawkshead (Isabel Ross), pp. 499-501.

Painting and the poetry of Keats: some further identifications (D. S. Bland), pp. 502-4.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. liii, No. 1, August 1955

Hawthorne on the romance: his prefaces (Jesse Bier), pp. 17-24.

Dickens on art (Monroe Engel), pp. 25-38.

Goldsmith and the jest-books (Arthur Friedman), pp. 47-49.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

39ste Jaarg., Afl. 3, 1 Juli 1955

Notes on OE. texts (J. E. Cross), pp. 203-6.

The *Gawain* group. Cruxes, etymologies, interpretations (C. A. Luttrell), pp. 207-17.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lvi, Nos. 3-4, 17 May 1955

The beasts of battle in A.-S. poetry (Francis P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 81-90.

ME. *wery of wandred* (Tauno F. Mustanoja), pp. 90-94.

God amend wykkyd cowncsell (1464) (Rossell Hope Robbins), pp. 94-102.

Indian and Indies in Shakespeare (John W. Draper), pp. 103-12.

Further Chesterfield gleanings (Cecil Price), pp. 112-21.

Vol. lvi, Nos. 5-6, 24 September 1955

ME. *with an O and an I* (Tauno F. Mustanoja), pp. 161-73.

Troilus and Criseyde, iv. 607 (Tauno F. Mustanoja), pp. 174-7.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Vol. x, No. 2, September 1955

Vanity Fair and the Celestial City (Joseph E. Baker), pp. 89-98.

Providence, Fate, and the historical imagination in *The Heart of Midlothian* (P. F. Fisher), pp. 99-114.

Structure and imagery in *Adam Bede* (Maurice Hussey), pp. 115-29.

'Head,' 'Heart,' and 'Will' in Hawthorne's psychology (Marvin Laser), pp. 130-40.

The present tense in *Jane Eyre* (Edgar F. Shannon, Jr.), pp. 141-5.

Jane Austen: the theme of isolation (Samuel C. Burchell), pp. 146-50.

Hawthorne's 'The Ambitious Guest' (C. Hobart Edgren), pp. 151-6.

The ordinations in Jane Austen's novels (Clarence L. Branton), pp. 156-9.

R. H. Barham and Dickens's clergyman of *Oliver Twist* (William G. Lane), pp. 159-62.

The 'shy incongruous charm' of *Daisy Miller* (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), pp. 162-5.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. ii, New Series, No. 8, August 1955

'A Shrew' & 'The Shrew' (K. B. Danks), pp. 331-2.

Another human footstool (John J. O'Connor), p. 332.

The fair-haired man: an Elizabethan superstition (Raymond Chapman), p. 332.

The cause of the Trojan war, according to Peele (John D. Reeves), p. 333.

Thomas Goffe's 'The Courageous Turke' (John P. Cutts), pp. 333-5.

Some notes on the vocabulary of John Marston—V (Gustav Cross), pp. 335-6.

[See *N. & Q.*, ii. 186-7; continued *ibid.*, ii. 427-8.]

'Arden of Feversham'—an early reference (Glenn H. Blayney), p. 336.

Poems on the 'Spanish Marriage' of

Prince Charles (C. F. Main), pp. 336-40.

Marvell's 'Bergamot' (William R. Orwen), pp. 340-1.

An early elevation of Herrick (R. G. Howarth), p. 341.

Herrick's epitaph on his niece Elizabeth (R. G. Howarth), pp. 341-2.

Probability in Restoration drama (David S. Berkeley), pp. 342-4.

[See *N. & Q.*, ii. 237-9.]

The Hepburn 'Tatler', Edinburgh, 1711 (R. B. White, Jr.), pp. 344-5.

The *O.E.D.* definition of 'flail' (John M. Steadman), p. 345.

The 'M' in Fielding's 'Champion' (John B. Shipley), pp. 345-51.

[See *N. & Q.*, ii. 240-5.]

Sir Brooke Boothby's 'Basil Tree of Salernum' and Keats's 'Isabella' (David Bonnell Green), pp. 351-2.

Matthew Arnold: two unpublished letters (Kenneth Allott), pp. 356-7.

Matthew Arnold's Rugby prizes (R. H. Super), p. 357.

Vol. ii, New Series, No. 9, September 1955

The topicality of 'The Misfortunes of Arthur' (William A. Armstrong), pp. 371-3.

The relation of 'Macbeth' to 'Sophonisba' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 373-4.

George Wither in prison (Lyle H. Kendall, Jr.), p. 380.

Two poems by Herrick? (R. G. Howarth), pp. 380-1.

John Collop and the flames without light ('Paradise Lost', i. 62-63) (John M. Steadman), pp. 382-3.

Proofreading of 'Paradise Lost' (Robert O. Evans), pp. 383-4.

John Spencer's 'Discourse' (Ronald W. Hepburn), pp. 384-7.

Eighteenth century political controversy and linguistics (Robert Donald Spector), pp. 387-9.

Smollett, Dr. John Hill, and the failure of 'Peregrine Pickle' (William Scott), pp. 389-92.

Self-quotation in Johnson's 'Dictionary' (W. R. Keast), pp. 392-3.

Goldsmith and the 'Present State of Russia and France' (Morris Golden), pp. 393-4.

Young and the 'Méditations poétiques' (C. M. Lombard), pp. 397-8.

Matthew Arnold's 'barbarians' (Charles T. Dougherty), pp. 401-2.

Corporal Trim's hat (George L. Barnett), pp. 403-4.

Vol. ii, New Series, No. 10, October 1955

An apparent allusion to 'Titus Andronicus' (Paul E. Bennett), pp. 422-4.

Shakespeare's 'King John' and a patriotic slogan (P. J. Frankis), pp. 424-5.

Measure for Measure, i. i. 3-9 (D. S. Brewer), p. 425.

The fatal Elizabethan sisters in 'Macbeth' (Robert R. Reed, Jr.), pp. 425-7.

Lovelace's 'Flie' (Norman Nathan), pp. 428-9.

Dryden's 'eminent French critic' in a parallel of poetry and painting (Samuel Holt Monk), p. 433.

'Bounce to Fop' by Swift and Pope (Thomas Mabbott), p. 433.

Florio and Pope (A. Davenport), p. 433.

Goldsmith and 'National Concord' (Morris Golden), pp. 436-8.

Genealogical satire in 'Humphry Clinker' (Kelsie B. Harder), pp. 441-3.

Two notes on Keats's 'Endymion' (Lloyd N. Jeffrey), pp. 446-7.

The Oxford English Dictionary (M. D. W. Jeffreys), pp. 451-3.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxx, No. 4, Part 1, September 1955

The differences in Melville's poetry (Laurence Barrett), pp. 606-23.

'Seraph of Heaven': A Shelleyan

dream in Hardy's fiction (Phyllis Bartlett), pp. 624-35.

'Song of Myself' as inverted mystical experience (James E. Miller, Jr.), pp. 636-61.

Sartor Resartus and Carlyle's 'conversion' (Carlisle Moore), pp. 662-81.

Critical approval of epic poetry in the age of Wordsworth (Donald M. Foerster), pp. 682-705.

The pattern of Swift's women (Irvin Ehrenpreis), pp. 706-16.

The function of imagery in Webster (Hereward T. Price), pp. 717-39.

Hamlet as minister and scourge (Fredson Bowers), pp. 740-9.

Divided command in Shakespeare (Paul A. Jorgensen), pp. 750-61.

The meaning of *Pearl* (Marie Padgett Hamilton), pp. 805-24.

Beowulf: a study in dilatation (George J. Engelhardt), pp. 825-52.

Eras in English poetry (Josephine Miles), pp. 853-75.

Four unpublished letters of Carlyle (Susanne H. Nobbe), pp. 876-84.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURA MODERNE E COMPARATE

Anno viii, No. 2, Aprile-Giugno 1955

Trenta lettere inedite di Sir Henry Wotton nell' Archivio di Stato di Firenze (Anna Maria Crinò), pp. 105-26.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Vol. xxxiii, 1954

The Chronicles and the *Three Parts* of *Henry VI* (Robert Adger Law), pp. 13-32.

Architectonic structure in *Paradise Regained* (Alexander H. Sackton), pp. 33-45.

Scots literature and Scottish antiquarians, 1750-1800 (Alexander Manson Kinghorn), pp. 46-59.

The background of Coleridge's *Theory of Life* (Roy R. Male, Jr.), pp. 60-68.

Imagery in *Walden* (John C. Broderick), pp. 80-89.

Melville's *Pierre* as Hawthorne (Marjorie Kimball McCorquodale), pp. 97-102.

Morris's treatment of Greek legend in *The Earthly Paradise* (Oscar Maurer), pp. 103-18.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lii, No. 3, July 1955

Spenser's oak and briar (Paul E. McLane), pp. 463-77.

The art of 'whining' love (David S. Berkeley), pp. 478-96.

More Coleridge marginalia (Cecil C. Seronsy), pp. 497-501.

Zola and Conrad's 'The Idiots' (Milton Chaikin), pp. 502-7.